

SATURDAY REVIEW

POLITICS, LITERATURE, SCIENCE, AND ART.

No. 826, Vol. 32.

August 26, 1871.

[Registered for
transmission abroad.]

Price 6d.

THE PROROGATION.

A SPEECH from the Throne at the beginning of a Session is for the most part an important State paper; at the end of the Session it is a decorous form. It sometimes happens that at the moment of prorogation the Government has some important event to communicate to Parliament, such as the notice given by the French Government of terminating or modifying the Commercial Treaty; but the substance of the Speech consists in a concise review of the legislation of the year. It is neither possible nor desirable that anything original should be said; but even a ceremonial statement may be made with various degrees of grace and propriety. When it was asserted that PITT was capable of delivering a King's Speech offhand, his admirers attributed to him the ready command of a style at once significant, concise, and stately. The typical language of Royalty was not obscure, unequal, or passionate, and, above all, it was not argumentative. It became the Sovereign to assume that what was done was well done, and that the work of Parliament was satisfactory and complete. Mr. GLADSTONE, who is not inferior in rhetorical faculty to his famous predecessor, could, if it were necessary, also make an extemporaneous speech in the name of the QUEEN; and if his prudence and calmness could be as fully relied upon as his fluency, he would speak much better than he writes; but PITT would never have kept two Houses of Parliament waiting for the purpose of proving that WEDDERBURN or LAW considered one of the measures of the Government legal or constitutional. Mr. GLADSTONE and Mr. CARDWELL must have been profoundly impressed with the adverse verdict of public opinion when they postponed the prorogation for some minutes that they might shelter themselves under the authority of the eminent lawyer who habitually protects a friendly Government. Sir ROUNDELL PALMER unnecessarily disavowed expressions of disapproval which had not been attributed to him, when Mr. TORRENS drew a natural inference from his absence. It seems that he considers the issue of the Royal Warrant "the least objectionable course which could be taken under the whole circumstances of the case." It would not be difficult to maintain, even against Sir ROUNDELL PALMER, an opposite conclusion, but it is useless to revert to a controversy which has been thoroughly threshed out. It was a mistake to attach extraordinary importance to the opinion of a single member of Parliament, but if Mr. CARDWELL thinks that it was absolutely necessary to prove that Mr. TORRENS conjectured wrongly, he has undoubtedly shown that Sir ROUNDELL PALMER is satisfied with the policy of the Government.

The complacency with which the Government regards the condition of foreign affairs is perhaps shared by the majority of politicians. Those who, on the other hand, hold that the honour of the country has been gravely compromised by the Russian and American Treaties have no desire to revive recollections which are at the same time mortifying and useless. In both negotiations peace was secured by the total surrender of all points in dispute, nor has HER MAJESTY really "recommended by example that principle of amicable reference" which was proclaimed by the Treaty of Paris. Before the Americans would consent to a reference they successfully insisted on an apology, and on the paradoxical demand that the reference should be governed by rules which, according to the protest of the English negotiators, were inapplicable to the case. Any controversy may be easily settled if one disputant is willing to make all the concessions which are required. It may be hoped that the Canadian Government will, by assenting to the Treaty, not furnish the United States with an opportunity of illustrating the inevitable consequences of the boundless pliability of England. The paragraph which relates to the proposed alterations in the French

Treaty must be taken in connexion with previous declarations of the Government. M. THIERS and M. PUYER-QUÉRTIER apparently wish to increase the duties on some classes of imported goods, and at the same time to preserve the exemptions which were secured by the treaty to French productions. Either Lord GRANVILLE or Mr. GLADSTONE some time since publicly announced the intention of maintaining or of abandoning the Treaty as a whole; and it would have been well if the language of the QUEEN'S Speech had been equally decided and intelligible. The QUEEN or the Government "would witness with regret any change of a nature to restrict that commercial intercourse between the two countries which has done so much for their closer union"; yet it seems that the Government is "anxious to meet the wishes of a friendly Power, and to give scope for any measures calculated to meet its fiscal exigencies." The Chief of the French State and the Finance Minister think that fiscal exigencies may be most effectually met by increased Customs duties which will at the same time, according to their belief, stimulate French industry. The French nation is the sole judge of its own fiscal exigencies and of its commercial policy; but there is no reason why obligations should be incurred by England for the purpose of facilitating the return to a mistaken system. Mr. COBDEN, as a sound economist, knew that every reduction of duties would be as beneficial to the buyer as to the seller; and in conceding total exemption or low rates of duty to French imports into England, he purchased, in a currency which he regarded as worthless, the far scantier reductions which M. ROUHER thought it possible to effect without too violent a shock to the prejudices of his countrymen. The bargain was confessedly unequal, because the English plenipotentiaries knew that cheap claret in England was not an onerous equivalent for the acquisition of a French market for cotton twist. The practical advantages of the Treaty afforded some compensation for the infringement of sound economical principles; but as a general rule it is undesirable for a country to renounce absolute control over its own system of taxation. If the French Government desires to impose additional taxes on English products, it is not necessary to retaliate in kind; but it would be unreasonable that the Treaty, when the terms are altered, should continue to be binding on England. If the Government is consistent with the policy which has been already announced, M. THIERS and his Ministers will be informed that they must choose between the provisions of the existing Treaty and the restoration to both parties of complete freedom of action. A partial modification of the arrangement would weaken the majority in the Assembly which is opposed to the obsolete theories of the Executive Government.

It is a pity that the conventional gratitude of the QUEEN for "the liberal supplies which, under the circumstances of the year, she directed her Government to ask" of the House of Commons, should not be expressed in the QUEEN'S English. The annual demand for supplies is always made under, or more properly in, the circumstances of the year. In the present year the circumstances mean the necessity of replenishing the stores which had been partially exhausted for the purpose of keeping down the estimates in 1869 and 1870. The main part of the Speech has the defect of being controversial, and occasionally querulous. It was almost unnecessary to remark that some of the subjects mentioned in the Speech at the opening of the Session have not been brought to a definitive issue; nor is it a sufficient consolation that some laws "added to the Statute Book" are described as important. The business of Parliament is to pass laws, and not to add them to the Statute Book, though such an operation is customary and useful. A Court of Law is properly said to deliver judgments, and not to add them to the

volumes of Reports. The Army Regulation "Bill" is accurately described as not including the enactment which Mr. GLADSTONE described as its principal or sole provision. It is satisfactory to find that the Westmeath Coercion Act has "thus far answered its purpose," although it is irrelevant to remind Parliament that this Act was passed after a full examination of the facts. The proceedings of the Government with respect to the Select Committee might advantageously be forgotten. Whether the repeal of the Ecclesiastical Titles Act, the abolition of University Tests, and the Trade Unions Act have "brought to conclusion long continued and serious controversies," is a question to be answered by experience; but it is proper that the official view of legislative measures should be confident and cheerful. The Local Government Board Act may perhaps "prepare the way for important sanitary and administrative improvements." For the present it changes the title of a Minister, and it transfers certain duties from the Home Office and the Privy Council to another department. There was no reason why Mr. FORSTER should be troubled with precautions against cattle disease or cholera; and it is impossible that the President of the new Board should administer sanitary matters more inefficiently than the HOME SECRETARY. The Act relating to the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council is a clumsy makeshift; but an acknowledgment of a neglected duty, and an awkward attempt to discharge it in part, are better than the contumacious perversity of last year's attempt at legislation. Mr. GLADSTONE cannot dismiss members to their recreations without warning them that they must be prepared for future labours and sufferings. As he cannot set them a holiday task, there is some hope that their enjoyment may be restrained by the intimation that future Sessions will be as laborious as the last. "For a long time to come" there will be plenty to do, or, in other words, "there is no prospect of lightening the honourable but arduous burdens of legislation." Captious opponents may perhaps suggest that the honourable and arduous burden of legislation would be perceptibly lightened by greater vigour, by better management, and by a more considerate regard to the feelings and even to the prejudices of members. On the other hand, it may be admitted that the duties of Parliament are temporarily lightened by the habit of proposing measures so impracticable that they are not even pressed to a second reading. A good Licensing Bill would have required much discussion, but Mr. BRUCE's scheme required no further exposure of its absurdity than his opening statement. The House of Commons will bear with fortitude a temporary separation from Mr. GLADSTONE and his colleagues.

GERMANY AND AUSTRIA.

THE Emperors of GERMANY and AUSTRIA have arranged a meeting at Gastein, and much speculation has arisen as to the objects of their meeting. Rumour says that one of the main subjects to be discussed is the repudiation of its railway bonds by Roumania. For many months Prince BISMARCK has been endeavouring to get the Roumanian Government to do justice to the bondholders, but hitherto without effect; and as he does not like to be beaten, and as his task is full of difficulty, he naturally seeks help from the Power most likely to be able and willing to give it, and that Power is obviously Austria. The Roumanian Government some years ago gave a concession for making a system of railways of great mileage length to Dr. STROUSBERG and other Germans. The Roumanian Government undertook to issue a certain number of bonds for each kilometre of railway, and in process of time it did issue a large number of bonds, bearing the unconditional guarantee of the Government. There was nothing in the bond to warn the bondholder that the guarantee was only to be effective if certain stipulations were fulfilled by the concessionnaires of the Railway, and the bonds were accordingly placed with success, and almost entirely in Germany. But the Roumanian Government now denies its responsibility on three grounds. It asserts that more bonds have been issued than was warranted by the kilometrical length of the completed sections; secondly, that the sections tendered to it as completed are not really completed, and that a large sum must be spent to put these sections in proper order; and, lastly, that the concessionnaires were bound to provide the interest on the bonds until the railway was completed. It recognises no rights in the bondholders except those which they derive from the concessionnaires, and affects to treat them as if they were the parties who had taken the contracts to make the railways. It does not acknowledge that it is repudiating any just claims on it, and expresses its willingness to treat the bondholders

fairly according to its own notion of fairness. If they could manage to reduce the amount of the issue to the proper kilometrical proportion, and to subscribe enough among themselves to complete the sections which have been only nominally completed, then the Roumanian Government is willing to pay the stipulated interest on the stipulated amount. It is necessary to explain this, in order to understand what is the ground of the resistance offered by the Roumanian Chambers and Ministry, not only to the great BISMARCK, but to their own unhappy Prince CHARLES. To put it briefly, they think they are merely defending themselves against being cheated by a clique of foreigners. And that this clique of foreigners happens to be a German clique only adds bitterness to their determination not to be cheated. The Roumanians detest the Germans. They are afraid of them and dislike their ways. Having persuaded a HOHENZOLLERN to be silly enough to undertake to govern them, they hate and despise him for his folly. They regard everything done on behalf of Germans as the result of a Court intrigue; and the Prince was actually compelled a few weeks ago to give his consent to a Bill offering to the bondholders such terms as those above stated, by the assurance of his Ministers that, if he refused, there would probably be a general massacre of Germans throughout Roumania.

It is scarcely necessary to say that, according to the rules which govern the civilized world, the claims of the bondholders are unimpeachable. The Roumanian Government chose to issue bonds with an unconditional guarantee, and it was solely because these bonds bore an unconditional guarantee that they were marketable. No investor would look at a bond purporting to ensure that, if an unfinished railway was finished to the satisfaction of the Roumanian Government, that Government would see the interest on the bond duly paid. The Russian Government was the first to set the example of making railways by means of bonds with unconditional guarantees, and the investors in the Roumanian railway bonds had every right to suppose that they were getting from Roumania exactly the same security that Russia had been in the habit of giving them. But nothing will persuade the Roumanians that this is the proper way of looking at the transaction. They regard the bondholders as Germans, who, if pillaged, have been pillaged by the German concessionnaires. As the bondholders have undoubtedly suffered a great wrong, Prince BISMARCK took up their cause immediately on its being ascertained that the January coupon was not to be paid. No one can doubt that he was quite entitled to do this. If the German bondholders had been merely the victims of repudiation practised by a petty State, it would, according to the notions which England has helped to make prevalent, have been a mistake to threaten this petty State with force. Yet the Government of a State the subjects of which have suffered a great wrong from the Government of another State is quite right in doing all it can by argument and expostulation to achieve redress for those who are injured. But then Roumania is in a very peculiar position. It is a State the very existence of which is due to the protection and guarantee of the Great Powers, of whom Germany is one; and it has borrowed a certain amount of credit and respectability from having a HOHENZOLLERN on its throne. Prince BISMARCK has never threatened the Roumanians with war, but he has done all he could to bring home to them that the course they choose to pursue is one of great danger to them. They have refused to listen to him, however, and they have done this principally because they feel assured of the support of Russia. Prince BISMARCK tried to get Russia to combine with him in exercising pressure on the Roumanians, but Russia refused; and he subsequently asked Turkey to interfere as the nominal suzerain of Roumania, but Turkey was too prudent to risk a collision with Russia. This, then, is the present state of things. The Roumanians, relying on Russia, have forced a German Prince to pass a bill robbing German bondholders, by an intimation that otherwise the life of no German in Roumania would be safe. Austria is as much interested as Germany in the issue thus presented. The inhabitants of the banks of the Danube towards its mouth are barbarians, with a very slight veneer of French civilization, and Germany and Austria, which must keep the navigation of the Danube free at all hazards cannot afford to give semi-barbarians like the Roumanians the impression that they are weak and distant Powers, and that Russia is strong and near. They, too, will be thought strong and near if they are seen acting openly in concert with regard to Roumania, and Prince BISMARCK has been endeavouring—it is not yet known with what success—to induce Austria to act in concert with Germany in the matter.

It is quite true that this might raise the eternal Eastern question. Russia may take offence at the concert of Germany and Austria, and France is said to have ventured on giving a safe stroke of annoyance to its conquerors, and to have assured the Roumanians of its sympathy. There are a thousand things to quarrel about in the East if those who would have to fight wished to quarrel. But there is no more reason to suppose that the dispute about the claims of the Roumanian bondholders will be the final ground of quarrel than that any other possible dispute will be. The three great Eastern Powers do not wish for war, and France is at present far too weak and helpless to be able or desirous to stir up war among them. But although Germany and Russia are, and may continue to be, excellent friends, neither of them can help thinking of a possible future of a different kind, and Germany cannot see with indifference the tribes of the Danube being quietly Russianized during this period of repose. In order to be able to meet Russia on equal terms in the East, Germany must be on good terms with Austria; and the conviction of this necessity has lately led to a very curious modification in the views entertained by German politicians as to the German provinces of Austria. The Austrian Germans have been provoked and aggrieved by the decision of the Emperor of AUSTRIA to give way to the wishes of the Slavonian provinces, and to break up, if he can, the dictatorship over them which the German provinces have hitherto exercised. In their feeling of mortification at this decision, the German provinces, or at any rate a leading party in them, began to look towards Berlin, and to think that the time was come for that unification of the whole Fatherland on which it was supposed Prussia was bent. But such overtures as they have made in this direction have been promptly repulsed, and they have received an intimation from Berlin that they mistake the signs of the times. They can help Germany much more by staying in Austria than by leaving it. Austria is a necessity to Germany, and Austria without its German provinces would not be Austria. They must learn to do their best towards disposing of the heterogeneous forces of Austria in such a way as best to serve Germany. The EMPEROR does not want eight million more subjects so much as he wants to prevent Russia from getting the command of the Danube. If Germany, however, in dealing with the East is obliged to be cautious, much more so is Austria, on whom the brunt of war would fall, and who is always going through domestic difficulties. Probably, therefore, the direct consequences of the meeting of the EMPERORS will not apparently be very great; but a general policy may have been agreed on, the fruits of which will be seen slowly but surely in future years.

THE PROSPECTS OF THE RECESS.

THE first election during the recess has furnished an impressive commentary on the assumption of the Ministers that they had the country with them in their recent proceedings, and were therefore entitled to do what they pleased, regardless of Parliamentary usages and constitutional forms. This was the invariable answer to all remonstrances. A factious Opposition in the House of Commons might rage and the Lords might imagine a vain thing, but, as Mr. GLADSTONE was an infallible exponent of the national will, it was not only impracticable but wicked to resist him. When a late distinguished man of science found himself hard pressed in an argument, he always fell back on the stereotyped retort that his opponent was banishing the Deity from the universe. Mr. GLADSTONE has adapted to his own purposes a useful plagiarism from this simple formula. *Vox populi vox Dei*, and Mr. GLADSTONE speaks for the people. There may be two Gods, but there is only one prophet. A claim to inspiration necessarily puts an end to argument, and the only question is how far, in point of fact, the claim can be justified. It is unfortunate for the pretensions of the Government that, on the only occasion on which the country has had an opportunity of expressing its opinion, a decisive verdict has been returned against them. It is possible to overrate, but not to explain away, the significance of the fact that for the first time in a quarter of a century a Conservative has been returned by the electors of East Surrey. From 1847 until now both seats have invariably been filled by Liberals, and the attempts which have been made to divide the representation in recent years seemed only to prove the impregnable position of the dominant party. East Surrey is not an ordinary constituency, and its defection is a serious event. That such a constituency should now turn round and elect by a large majority an utterly unknown young man, merely

because he is an opponent of the Government, is a circumstance which it is not easy to reconcile with the theory that Mr. GLADSTONE has had public opinion on his side in his conduct of affairs. The suddenness of Mr. BUXTON's death allowed no time for preparations for a contest, and the Liberals had the great advantage derived from previous possession of the ground. They had a further advantage in the candidate whom they started, himself a popular man, and a relative of the most popular member of the Cabinet, well known as a proprietor and resident in the county, who had been in Parliament before, and had acquired some reputation as a discreet and sagacious member, true to his principles, and affable to his constituents. There can be no doubt that Mr. LEVESON-GOWER commanded the confidence of his party, and that his election would have been peculiarly pleasing to the Government. It does not appear, however, that his party, and especially its leaders, had the confidence of the electors. Until Mr. WATNEY turned up the other day, his existence was unknown. He is "no orator as BRUTUS is," and he frankly told the electors that he had been brought up to business, and had only just begun to give his mind to politics. With touching and ingenuous candour, he confessed that he liked great principles, and could not be bothered with details. Apparently Mr. WATNEY is an honest, well-meaning young gentleman, and if he cannot speak no doubt he may be trusted to vote steadily against the Government, which, we gather, was what the electors mainly had in view in returning him. It has been remarked that, though Mr. WATNEY himself is unknown, his name is familiar on his father's signboards. It is true that Mr. WATNEY is a brewer, but so was Mr. BUXTON. The influence of the publicans was exerted very strongly on Mr. WATNEY's behalf, and perhaps helped materially to turn the scale in his favour. This is so far an explanation of the defeat of the Government candidate, but it does not relieve the Government from the responsibility of having brought about this result by their mismanagement of affairs. The hostility of the publicans is due to Mr. BRUCE's Licensing Bill; but it was a serious error in statesmanship, as well as an injury to the public interests, that the organized opposition of an influential body of this kind should have been provoked by a crude and imperfect measure, for the adequate consideration of which no time had been allowed in the Government programme. Mr. BRUCE has thrown enormous difficulties in the way of legislating effectually on this subject. For the present the interested opposition of the publicans coincides with the general irritation and dissatisfaction of the public at large. The brewing interest is strong in many places besides East Surrey; and the numerous other interests throughout the country which the Government has rashly and recklessly attacked or menaced with revolutionary projects are ready to join with it against the common enemy.

It cannot be pretended that the East Surrey election exhibits that wild enthusiasm for Mr. GLADSTONE or the Ballot which we had been led to expect; and there are some other signs that the Radicals distrust the vitality of the Ballot as an election cry, and are seeking to couple it with a more attractive and exciting appeal to democratic support. The Ballot and the Abolition of the House of Lords is to be the "two-headed-nightingale combination" of the Radical caravan, with which they mean to perambulate the country. It must be confessed that it is a sweet thing in monsters, and does credit to the ingenuity of the didactic gentlemen below the gangway who have contrived it for the amusement of the country during the recess. The orators who have this week denounced the aristocracy, with a warmth appropriate to the season, at Birmingham and Leeds, were extremely scornful and contemptuous of the degenerate practice of shooting on the moors; but a course of fresh air and wholesome exercise of a similar kind might be prescribed with advantage for the dyspeptic SOLONS of the manufacturing towns. When Mr. GLADSTONE gave the Lords a slap in the face the other day, there were great rejoicings over this "act of righteous energy," which had put heart once more—so it was announced—into the Liberal party. But that unfortunate party seems to be threatened with a relapse, and this time a mere slap in the face will not be enough, and nothing short of the decapitation of the obnoxious Assembly will do any good. The Radicals are like a stupid fellow who fancies himself bewitched, and who cannot rest till he has taken vengeance on some innocent person who, in his distempered imagination, is the author of his woes. All the aches and pains of the body politic are attributed to the malignant incantations of the Lords. Mr. DIXON and Alderman CARTER

picture the sorcerers of the Upper House perpetually sticking pins into their red benches, and muttering strange spells which straightway compel the Liberals to quarrel furiously among themselves—the moderate Right parting in distrust from the revolutionary Left, and honest gentlemen below the gangway raging in their hearts because the Government will not look in that laboriously advertised direction for administrative genius, or, worse still, because it does look, and chooses one of them for office, leaving the others more distempered and disgusted than before. Mr. DIXON and Mr. MUNDELLA naturally resent the idea that they were to be conciliated by finding room for Mr. STANSFELD in the Cabinet. They are at least entitled to say that they intimated plainly enough what they did want.

At both the meetings a great deal of fun, of the usual platform kind, was got out of the rejection of the Ballot Bill by the Lords on the plea of want of time to consider it. The same plea was used by the Government as an excuse for dropping much more urgent and practically important measures which had been sent down by the Lords to the House of Commons. As we pointed out before, the reason why there was not time to deal with the Ballot Bill was not that the Lords could not forego their autumn holiday, but that if they had taken the trouble to lick the Bill into shape, and do what the Commons avowedly left undone, the measure would have gone back, not to the House of Commons as it should be, but only to a mere Rump composed of Ministers and their more servile adherents. Mr. DIXON holds that the Lords should have discussed the principle of the Ballot, and swallowed the details on trust. Nothing can be simpler than the principle of the measure, but, as the House of Commons discovered, difficulties begin as soon as the details are examined. It is essentially a measure of detail, and the Lords would certainly have shirked their obvious duty if they had followed Mr. DIXON's advice. At Leeds the aldermen came out in great force. Alderman JOY complained that, when the people were at the trouble and expense of electing members, the members were not allowed to settle everything their own way, but were sometimes interfered with by the peers. Alderman TATHAM was very sorry for the Lords, who would certainly be entitled to some sympathy if the succeeding speaker had his own way. This gentleman advocated the "constitutional abolition" of the House of Lords, adding that "the people did not wish to interfere with the property of the peers, but they wanted 'to help on progress'—a tolerably plain intimation of the direction in which it is intended to progress. Alderman CARTER, who is also one of the local members, was most anxious, he said, to say nothing disrespectful of the peers. With noble humility he confessed that, if he had been born a peer, he might perhaps have been no better himself. Like the Puritan who, when he saw a malefactor led off to punishment, used to exclaim, "There go I but for the grace of God," so Alderman CARTER never looks upon the miserable and degraded occupants of the Upper Chamber without humbling himself in heart and thanking Heaven for the benignant intervention which spared him from such a fate, and raised him instead to the lofty moral elevation of an alderman and Radical borough member. There is one point on which the assaults of the Lords are not quite decided as to their line of attack. In the same breath Mr. CARTER accuses them of doing too much and doing too little. A great many of them, he said, never attend the House at all; and those who do attend seldom sit for more than half an hour. Another characteristic argument is that the Lords ought to be abolished, because there are not enough of them. Mr. DIXON in foolish bitterness, not only against the House of Lords but against dignities of every kind, outstripped the comparatively sober nonsense of the Leeds aldermen. He would "sweep away all privilege, all rank, all merely titled distinctions." He "wished the poorest labourer to be able to walk 'the streets the equal of the proudest and the richest.'" A broad level of democratic equality in which no man's vanity shall be offended by any indication of social superiority in others is Mr. DIXON's generous ideal; but cupidity is a stronger passion than vanity, and would demand a similar gratification. Mr. DIXON probably did not see the full force of his admission that at present the peers, shut up in their own House with a practically limited range of functions, are debarred from exercising their natural influence and authority in the chief branch of the Legislature. Simply to abolish the House of Lords would therefore, he said, have the effect of "materially, if not dangerously, increasing the Conservative element in the House of Commons." One would hardly be surprised to find the member for Birmingham, in his blind hatred of an aristocracy,

adopting seriously the satirical suggestion that peers and their families should be doomed to compulsory celibacy till the whole race died out. One of the saddest experiences of the great tribune on his return from his mournful seclusion will be the discovery of the sort of men who have been mountebanking in his room. A few more demonstrations under Mr. DIXON's leadership will render more certain a succession of elections similar to that in East Surrey.

THE NEW YORK FRAUDS.

IN the absence of political excitement, the most interesting subject of discussion in the United States is the financial administration of the city of New York. Two noble aspirations hitherto unsatisfied in Europe have been fully realized in the commercial capital of America. A great city, governed by a commune or municipality elected by universal suffrage, is at the same time an Irish Republic. No central despotism interferes with the free action of the Mayor, Aldermen, and Common Council, nor is Irish public spirit restrained and thwarted by intrusive aliens. The result is an annual corporate expenditure of 5,000,000*l.*, or rather a taxation producing that amount of revenue; for the outlay on public objects is indefinitely smaller than the receipts. A part of the residue appears in the form of large fortunes accumulated by a few notorious local politicians. The most conspicuous of the number a few years ago became bankrupt as a small tradesman, and, having exchanged business for politics, he now maintains a splendid establishment. The Mayor of New York is his close ally; the Governor of the State was largely indebted to him for his election; and it is believed that if the Democratic party secures a majority he will be able to appoint the next President. The rulers of the city are leading members of the well-known Tammany organization, and they are intimately associated with Fisk and the confederate railway swindlers. The Judges nominated by Tammany Hall are notoriously paid agents of the Erie Directors, who also control the Legislature at Albany. A part of the plunder obtained by railway frauds and by municipal corruption is employed in the payment of subordinate accomplices and in the management of elections. Another portion, awarded in violation of all American principles to the maintenance of Roman Catholic schools, purchases the connivance of the priests and the active support of their disciples. There is probably no precedent in history for so mean, so audacious, and so successful a conspiracy. The managers of the system, profiting by the demoralization which they have themselves created, scarcely take the trouble to disguise or to excuse their insolent frauds. The wealthiest traders find it more convenient to pay enormous taxes than to resist, and the respectable population is powerless against the rabble and its nominees. London ratepayers who habitually grumble at the inefficiency and wastefulness of the parochial King Log will do well to remember that a King Stork constituted on the New York model might impose on a city three times as populous as New York a taxation of fifteen millions sterling.

The *New York Times* has with admirable courage and perseverance devoted itself for many weeks to a convincing exposure of one flagrant class of municipal frauds. Mr. OAKLEY HALL, Mayor of New York, Mr. TWEED, Mr. SWEENEY, and Mr. CONOLLY are the principal culprits. For the present they have set their accusers at defiance; and the proof of their guilt will probably endear them still more closely to their constituents; but there is reason to believe that the figures and statements of the *New York Times* will materially affect the prospects of the Democratic party at the Presidential election. By some means the *New York Times* obtained possession of the Controller's accounts relating to the County expenditure on certain public buildings, and the Editor may be believed when he asserts that the result of the City balance-sheet will be far more startling. For the repairs of County buildings one firm of plasterers received in two years more than 500,000*l.*, while the plumber's bill amounted to 80,000*l.* For cabinet-work and furniture a Mr. INGERSOLL signed receipts for 500,000*l.*, and the price of the carpets supposed to have been supplied would have covered the City Park at the rate of 1*l.* for the square yard. In the whole nearly 2,000,000*l.* were paid for repairs and furniture of buildings to three favoured firms, and the inference is irresistible that the Mayor and his accomplices divided the spoils with their fortunate tradesmen. The accused patriots have met the charges with a series of contradictory answers resembling the pleas in an old-fashioned record. The Mayor asserts that his duty in signing the orders for money was only ministerial and obligatory, although it

must certainly have been his duty to disclose a series of gross and transparent frauds. It has also been stated that the published accounts were not genuine, that they had been surreptitiously obtained, and that they had all been published before. The last excuse, which answers the previous explanations, appears to be true in fact; but, as a critic in the *New York Times* justly remarks, the items separately convey no information, and it was only when they were added up that the extravagance of the pretended outlay was disclosed. The defence on which the HALLS and the TWEEDS substantially rely consists in the expectation that the whole affair will blow over. It is highly probable that their hopes will be justified by the event; nor can it be expected that the *New York Times*, having fully discharged a difficult duty, will continue beyond a certain point to urge the necessity of reform on an unwilling community. The other journals of New York have, through jealousy or under the influence of worse motives, shrunk from supporting the *New York Times* in its spirited efforts. Their silence is perhaps explained by the statement that nearly all the journals of the city are in the pay of the Tammany gang, which, if the *New York Times* is accurate, subsidizes the *New York Herald* to the amount of 11,000*l.* a-year. In a future Session of the New York Legislature, TWEED will probably procure the passing of a law of libel which will put a stop to troublesome disclosures, and unless the majority at his back can be shaken, it is useless to appeal to reason or justice. In other parts of the United States there is generally a wavering body of comparatively honest politicians which inclines the balance against any party which may be involved in a flagrant scandal; but the Irish voters of New York have neither scruples as to corruption nor prejudices in favour of Republican institutions. Accustomed to sell themselves, they are willing to be sold, and it is nothing to them that the revenue to which they contribute nothing is stolen. In some instances the indignation of the genuine Americans is too strong even for the rulers of New York. The same HALL, well known as a professed patron of the Fenian conspiracy, committed a gross blunder in forbidding the procession of Orangemen; and his more respectable ally and official superior was obliged to repair the error. It is doubtful whether any similar feeling can be aroused against pecuniary corruption. The discredit into which the class of politicians has fallen in America necessarily involves a low standard of public opinion. Many respectable persons who may have been surprised by the details of the fraudulent bills for plastering and plumbing will remember on second thoughts that they had never supposed that the Mayor or the Controller was an honest man. It was not for the purpose of administering the public funds frugally and honestly that TWEED and HALL and SWEENEY were entrusted with power. It was sufficiently notorious that five millions a-year could not be employed in the management of the worst-paved and worst-lighted of populous cities. Even if the *New York Times* attains on the present occasion the success which it deserves, similar abuses will inevitably recur as soon as the immediate excitement has subsided.

The degradation of New York and of some other Atlantic cities is largely attributable to the Irish immigration; but in less disreputable communities the same results must follow from the dissociation of political power from liability to taxes. Mr. FAWCETT has on more than one occasion, in his honest solicitude for the credit of democracy, protested against the practice of throwing all pecuniary burdens on the rich for the purpose of raising funds to be spent by the nominees of the poor. Mr. GLADSTONE's satellites think that the working-classes have no interest in the independence of the country, and they draw the inference, practically adopted by Mr. GLADSTONE and Mr. LOWE, that the owners of property, having a monopoly of a sense of national honour, must pay in the form of Income-tax for the gratification of their fancy. In New York the dominant majority, though it unconsciously suffers from misgovernment, believes that in tolerating or promoting extravagance and fraud it is merely imposing additional burdens on the rich. The accumulated wealth of FISK or TWEED is tolerated because it is extracted by favourites of the populace out of the pockets of the respectable classes. In England some time must elapse before the traditions of former times are altogether abandoned; and as long as rates are levied on occupiers rather than on owners, there will be a check on municipal corruption; yet it is difficult to anticipate the working of a Metropolitan Corporation which would practically be elected by votes dependent on manual labour. The complications which might ensue would be difficult to correct, for a municipality of London would be almost

beyond the control of Parliament. In default of any exact analogy or precedent, the Commune of Paris and the Corporation of New York represent the tragic and comic sides of the tendencies of overgrown municipalities. Of the two chief types of local democracy, the swindlers of New York are, to a sound moral judgment, less detestable than the gloomy revolutionists of Belleville and Montmartre. American humour generally affects exaggeration, and there is something almost amusing in the pretended expenditure of 100,000*l.* in carpets for a building in which some floors are still bare, or are covered with oil-cloth.

FRANCE

THE French Assembly seems at last to have remembered that the work of the artist must be largely governed by the nature of his materials. For some time past it has been chafing against the provisional character of the position in which it finds itself. Few men like to live in a state of prolonged uncertainty, and when the subject to which this uncertainty relates is the constitution of the country, the wonder is rather perhaps that some seven hundred Frenchmen have consented to endure it so long, than that they have shown occasional symptoms of irritation at their inability to make events square with their wishes. But though an impatient desire to substitute a permanent organization for the present constitutional jury-mast is perfectly natural, it is not equally reasonable. Those who yield to it do not sufficiently consider the limitations of their constructive power. They have to deal with a state of things which is essentially and in its own nature provisional, and yet they hope to evolve from this a constitutional settlement which shall serve as a first step to something permanent. They forget that the disasters of which France has but just begun to see the term, have made the ordinary processes of national life difficult. It is no use to advise a man who is gasping for breath as to how he may best employ it when he gets it. His first business is to recover the proper use of his lungs. In the same way France has to take thought and trouble about things which in most established Governments are managed as a matter of course. She has to get a foreign army out of her territory, and to regain possession of her own fortresses. Before this can be accomplished, a great deal of money has to be paid, and whether this money is paid directly out of taxation or out of loans of which the interest is to be met by taxation, the business of raising it or of providing against the immediate liabilities incurred in raising it is enough to occupy the whole attention of the nation. The Government of which M. THIERS is the head is a Government appointed to do this special work, and as such it is necessarily provisional. Most provisional Governments have had a very different task assigned them; the task, that is, of framing a Constitution, or at least of carrying on affairs while some one else is framing a Constitution. But this does not prove that all provisional Governments ought to set about doing this, no matter what may be the object for which they were called into being. It is rather a precedent for provisional Governments confining themselves to their proper function. Besides, there are special reasons why the Government of M. THIERS ought to keep itself strictly within these limits. In many cases a provisional Government would be equally competent to do its work if it were to make itself the permanent Government. It would have violated the conditions of its appointment, but it would have undergone no other change. The peculiarity of the present Government of France is that it can only do its work by remaining provisional. Any hasty or premature attempt to assume a definitive shape, whether Monarchical or Republican, would introduce fresh divisions into the country, and thereby make the punctual payment of the indemnity, and the evacuation of territory depending on it, a sheer impossibility. With the Government remaining as it is, men of all opinions can agree in accepting it and in paying the taxes levied by it. But if the issue between Monarchy and Republicanism were declared to be settled, this provisional submission would be met with no longer. Whichever way the decision might go, it would be regarded by those who disliked it as a mere surprise, to be repudiated without delay or hesitation. The Monarchists would refuse to submit to a Republic, on the ground that it had been set up in defiance of the avowed wishes of the Assembly. The Republicans would refuse to submit to a Monarchy, on the ground that it had been set up in defiance of the secret wishes of the electors. Either way, the punctual payment of the indemnity would be endangered, and since any failure in this respect would entail a continuance of the German occupation, if not a

fresh German intervention, the first desire of all patriotic Frenchmen would be to set up a Government which should address itself to the single end of ridding the country of foreign troops. In other words, the inevitable consequences of divesting the present Government of its provisional character would be to necessitate the formation of a provisional Government to take its place.

Although, however, the THIERS Government cannot be made other than provisional without endangering the accomplishment of the purpose for which it chiefly exists, it is natural that the Assembly should wish to see some additional stability given to it. It seems hardly possible that M. THIERS should resign, because the mere hint of such a thing is still enough to get him his own way in everything. But he might die, or be laid aside by illness, and in either of these contingencies what would become of the Government? It must go to the grave with him in the one case, and must share his sick room in the other. The anxieties inseparable from such a prospect have diffused themselves over the whole Assembly, and in its original form the proposal to continue M. THIERS's powers seems to have been an attempt on the part of the Left to make capital out of a feeling which they knew to be shared by the Right. The majority of the Assembly wanted to be released from its absolute dependence on M. THIERS, and the minority offered to give them this release, on condition that M. THIERS was named President of the French Republic for three years. The majority, however, felt that to establish a Republic for three years certain might turn out to be nearly the same thing as establishing it for good, and this naturally seemed to them too high a price to pay for the right of forcing M. THIERS to dismiss his Ministers. The opponents of the proposal had a preponderance in the Committee appointed to report upon it, and the result has been a radical modification of the original motion. According to the latest account, the question of the Presidency of the Republic will not be raised. M. THIERS is to hold no new office, he is not even to hold his present office for any determinate period. He will have no other powers apparently than those delegated to him last February, nor will he retain these beyond the existence of the present Assembly. So one-sided a compromise as this will hardly be accepted by the Left. Their main object in prolonging M. THIERS's reign was to slip in an incidental recognition of the Republic under cover of a mere prolongation of the existing interregnum, and if this is defeated they will probably vote for leaving things alone. But their opposition will only serve to recommend the proposal to the Conservative Right. In its new form the proposal has the further advantage that it steers clear of a difficulty which led some of the soundest Liberal politicians in France to oppose it in the first instance. M. THIERS is to have the right of speaking before the National Assembly, though only, it seems, "under grave circumstances." There was something inexpressibly absurd in the notion of shutting out M. THIERS from the one place in which he is really fitted to exercise power, and relegating him to the passive obscurity of constitutional kingship. What France most needs at this moment is an able and powerful Minister, and the motion introduced by M. RIVER proposed to supply this want by compelling the only man who answers in any way to this description to delegate his duties as Minister to some one else. As altered by the Commission, this inconsistency is avoided. The Ministers are to be responsible to M. THIERS, not to the Assembly, and M. THIERS retains the right of speaking in the Chamber. An official who will still be able to defend his own acts in the Assembly, and whose Ministers are nothing more than heads of departments, responsible to him as their superior, will hold a position not easily distinguishable from that hitherto held by the Chief of the Executive Power.

The spirit of compromise seems to be uppermost in the Assembly at this moment. The question of the National Guard, which threatened at one time to generate a revolution, has been arranged on terms which are surprising from their common-sense simplicity. The members of the Republican Left have acknowledged that when every Frenchman is a soldier, there will be no need for every French townsman to be a National Guard in addition. But they say further that to disarm this force immediately, and with a haste amounting in effect to a censure on a body associated with many cherished Republican traditions, might involve considerable agitation in the large towns. There is not the least fear but that the regular army which the Assembly has at its disposal will be sufficient to put down any resistance offered by the National Guard at the expiration of that year of grace which the Republican Left ask for them. As there can be no danger in postponing the breaking up of the

force until that time, it would have argued a culpable indifference to the duty of conciliation to insist on doing by violence now what may be done equally well without violence by-and-by. Whether the Right would have been influenced by this consideration, supposing it to have stood alone, must remain doubtful, since the vote of the Assembly was prefaced by an exhibition of the usual whip. M. THIERS opposed the motion for immediate disarmament, and replied to the interruption of the Right by a reference to that terrible "resolve," the least mention of which is enough to overawe some seven hundred excited Frenchmen. After this, of course there was no more to be said, and an amendment embodying the compromise agreed to by the Left was carried by a large majority.

THE ADMIRALTY AND THE AGINCOURT.

THE Board of Admiralty has censured Vice-Admiral WELLESLEY because, "with such large and valuable ships "under his charge," he did not keep at a safe distance from a dangerous shoal. It is characteristic of the present Government to think first of the pecuniary consequences of conduct by which national reputation is endangered; but if the *Agincourt* had been lost upon the Pearl Rock, the naval character of this country would hardly have survived the disgraceful incident. It is useless for us to keep Gibraltar or any other naval station if our ships cannot quit a familiar anchorage without floundering among the rocks and shoals which lie outside it. We should have thought that Admiral WELLESLEY would at least have got out of sight of Gibraltar before he began to neglect his duty. He might have applied to himself, in a new sense, the words,

And all the Ocean makes my spacious grave;

and might have chosen some place a little less associated with the glorious traditions of the British navy to accomplish its humiliation. Among the many hundreds of officers who have sailed from Gibraltar, it probably never entered into the mind of any one that it was possible to run a ship in fine weather and broad daylight upon the Pearl Rock. Indeed it clearly appears that the Captain of the *Agincourt* would have done his not very difficult duty well if he had not had an Admiral to tell him how to do it. The cruise of the Channel Fleet resembles the battle of Balaklava, which would have been better managed if the British cavalry could have taken the field without generals. Any captain, if left to himself, would have given a wide berth to a shoal, and any colonel, if he could have used his judgment, would have declined to charge batteries with unsupported cavalry. But the Captain takes an order from the Admiral, and the Admiral receives a suggestion from the navigating officer of the fleet, and that officer consults a book of sailing directions, which are not quite correct because the Spaniards do not offer any facilities for ascertaining landmarks for the benefit of the English occupants of Gibraltar; and thus the *Agincourt* is run aground. The only parallel case is that of two steamers which ran into one another in the Eastern Ocean, when they might have kept miles asunder. The navigating officer of the flag-ship admitted that he shaped the course of the fleet as close in shore as he thought safe, in order to avoid a current and economize coal. We have lately seen reason to consider economy of coal a virtue, but, like other virtues, it may be practised in excess. The course shaped was, in the opinion of the navigating officer, safe, although near to danger. Unfortunately it went rather too near. He actually altered the course which had been signalled so as to take the fleet rather more to the westward, or, in other words, closer to a dangerous shoal; and while he did this the Admiral was taking breakfast or walking his stern gallery, and placidly receiving reports of the progress of the experiments in navigation which Staff-Commander KIDDLE was making in his name with the fleet which he had been brought from America to command. The ship which got aground was saved by a creditable exertion of skill and energy; but confidence in our navy and its administrators has been shaken by a succession of disasters, and cannot easily be restored. We have a fleet consisting of powerful ships, but numerically small. Within little more than a year we have lost one, and nearly lost another, ship of a class which are very costly, and which take much time, which may be more valuable than money, to replace. When people talk of the navy as a security against invasion, they forget that if we sent an adequate fleet to sea we should have almost no reserve of ships. When NELSON and CORNWALLIS watched the fleets of France and Spain, the fleets which they commanded

could be reinforced from a total naval strength of one hundred line-of-battle ships. It is not thus now, and perhaps it may never be thus again. But we had hoped until lately that, although ships might be few, seamen to work and fight them would be abundant. The grounding of the *Agincourt* inspires a fear that in the British navy seamen are more scarce than ships.

When we recall to mind the sights which have been seen from Gibraltar in former times, it is difficult to think without indignation of the spectacle lately exhibited to its garrison of a British Admiral running blindly into useless danger. Vice-Admiral WELLESLEY's account of his own contribution to the joint stock of blundering is as follows:—"While at breakfast an officer came in and stated to the Captain that the Staff-Commander wished to alter the course to S.W. by W., upon which the Captain repeated the same to me, and I sanctioned it, and ordered a signal to be made to the squadron to do so. Just before we left the breakfast-table the same thing occurred with regard to altering the course to W.S.W." Thus the Admiral, and the Captain, and Staff-Commander of the *Minotaur* were all concerned in doing that which, if they had left undone, the fleet would have been safe; but perhaps the day's consumption of coal would have been increased. On board the *Agincourt* Rear-Admiral WILMOT was in his cabin reading, and Captain BEAMISH had gone below to consult the doctor, leaving the ship in charge of Staff-Commander KNIGHT and Lieutenant BELL, who along with Captain BEAMISH have been tried by court-martial for "negligently stranding" the ship. It is not going too far to say that the fleet would have been better managed if all these officers had been left on shore. Vice-Admiral WELLESLEY did harm, and Rear-Admiral WILMOT did no good. The Channel Fleet would have been safer under the Admiral of a popular story, whose only order was "do what is proper and necessary, Mr. So-and-So." Rear-Admiral WILMOT was asked whether, when the course was altered to W.S.W., it occurred to him that the ship was steering too near the Pearl Rock, and he answered that it did not. The fleet was sailing in two columns, with the *Minotaur* leading the outer and the *Agincourt* leading the inner column. The distance between the columns, as well as between the ships composing them, was kept with faultless accuracy. We are told that this accuracy is "of the highest importance, and in fact absolutely essential to the safety of the ships, and to the correct performance of any evolution that may be ordered." We remember, however, that keeping station caused the loss of the *Captain*, and it has placed the *Agincourt* in a position of extreme peril. We should not object to risking even "a large and valuable ship" for an adequate reason; but here there was no reason at all, except perhaps that the navigating officer of the flag-ship desired to show his skill. When NELSON, at the entrance of Aboukir Bay, hailed Captain HOOD, and asked him if he thought there was sufficient depth of water for the British ships between the enemy's fleet and the shore, the answer was—"I don't know, sir, but with your permission I will stand in and try." If Captain HOOD's ship had got aground in this experiment, in a position where the British fleet could not have supported her, she must have taken her choice between surrender and destruction. Indeed a British line-of-battle ship, the *Hannibal*, was lost by an experiment of this kind within sight of Gibraltar and the Pearl Rock. In the month of July 1801 a French squadron which had escaped from Toulon passed Gibraltar, and, hearing that a British squadron was cruising off Cadiz, it anchored at Algeiras, in full view of the spot where the *Agincourt* ran aground. Sir JAMES SAUMAREZ, who commanded the British squadron off Cadiz, immediately raised the blockade and attacked the French squadron at Algeiras, hoping to destroy it before the Spanish squadron in Cadiz could come to its assistance. The attack failed and the *Hannibal* was lost. But on such an occasion it was necessary to risk something. Sir JAMES SAUMAREZ put into Gibraltar to refit after the action, and while his own flag-ship, the *Cæsar*, lay at the mole dismasted, he heard that the Spanish squadron had come out of Cadiz to escort their damaged allies from Algeiras into that harbour. By working day and night the British squadron was got ready before the combined fleet had quitted Algeiras. At noon on the 12th of July the enemy began to move. The *Cæsar* was warping out of the mole. The day was clear. The whole population of Gibraltar came out to witness the scene. The line-wall, mole-head, and batteries were crowded from the dockyard to the ragged staff. "The effect of this scene it is difficult to describe. Englishmen were proud of their country, and foreigners who beheld the scene wished to be Englishmen." As we transcribe these words from a contemporary historian we sadly feel

that the day when Englishmen might be proud of their country seems to have departed never to return. In the action which followed, two Spanish line-of-battle ships were burned and one was captured, and the remainder were driven into Cadiz. Captain HOOD, who had served under NELSON at Aboukir Bay, pursued the enemy so closely in this action that he ran his ship aground, and she was saved with extreme difficulty. But the prize he had in view was worth the risk. In those days it would have been impossible that either an admiral should give, or a captain should obey, such orders as caused the grounding of the *Agincourt*. Unless both admirals and captains can be taught to do their duty more efficiently, the British navy must be content henceforward with a purely historical reputation.

ELGIN SPEECHES.

UNDER the title of "Elgin Speeches" Mr. GRANT DUFF has collected into a volume the yearly addresses he has delivered since 1860 to his constituents in the Elgin Burghs. The inhabitants of those secluded Scotch towns are a favoured and peculiar people. They apparently take a burning interest in the domestic affairs not only of Great Britain, but of every nation under the sun. They want to know how the "nobles" have been voting in Sweden, and what is the last thing out in Dutch education. They are up to disquisitions on Central Asia, Spain, and Turkey. They are familiar with the writings of HEGEL and HEINE, and can enjoy the good sayings of MONTALEMBERT and BISMARCK. This being their state of mind, it is needless to say that their member is just the man to minister to their wants. Mr. GRANT DUFF is perhaps the best informed man in the House of Commons, and the variety of subjects into which he has thrown himself is astonishing. His volume is full of matter that is deserving of attentive perusal, although few persons out of the Elgin Burghs can pretend to say that they can check or criticize many of his statements. But we do not now refer to his volume for the purpose of examining its contents in detail. It is because it suggests two or three points in general politics that we wish to call attention to it. In the first place, it is the work of a sincere Liberal and of a Liberal of one particular type. There are many Liberals who will pronounce the type to be a comparatively humble one, for there is little of the philosophy or enthusiasm of democracy in it. But it is a type that seems to us an exceedingly useful one, and it is one with which we have great sympathy. Mr. GRANT DUFF's aim is to avoid revolution and encouragement of revolution and mob rule, by a steady, if slow, development of Liberal principles, doing justice to adversaries, and not being carried away by enthusiasm for friends. What most commends itself to us in Mr. GRANT DUFF's utterances is that he does not expect too much from the men or things he approves of, and that he says what he means plainly, without thinking that those who differ from him are knaves or fools. He is a great admirer of Mr. MILL, but he openly regretted the false position into which Mr. MILL put himself by his semi-patronage of the Fenians and the Hyde Park rioters. He holds that a change in the law of primogeniture and a simplification of conveyancing are good things in themselves and worth working for; but he guards his Elgin friends against believing that there will be any great improvement in the state of society when they have been accomplished. On the other hand, he can display considerable courage. In a Scotch burgh to a Scotch audience he ventured to protest against the tyranny which Scotch ministers exercise over their flocks, and he avowed his own partiality for secular education. But he would have nothing to do with that extreme form of Liberalism which will have all or nothing; and he told his constituents that he would welcome the best Education Bill he could practically get. He has satisfied himself that an honest man may without scruple vote with his party; and he hopes to see the Liberal party in a humdrum, old-fashioned way, by argument and debate, after some delay and many disappointments, gradually attain the ends which he thinks good. Nothing can be further from the ardent young Liberalism of the present day, which likes a scent of gunpowder in the air, and longs to do the grandest possible things in the greatest possible hurry.

But Mr. GRANT DUFF has something peculiarly his own; whereas the possession of this type of Liberalism is, we hope, shared by many others. What he wishes to impress on his countrymen through the medium of the Elgin burghers is that the great thing in political life is for a man to know what he is talking about. That "knowledge is power" is an old saying,

but it means something different, and is often employed in a delusive sense. What Mr. GRANT DUFF means is, that knowledge is the basis of right political action. The special field to which he has applied his maxim is that of foreign affairs; and it is a field in which the warning he conveys is much needed. England is always liable to fussiness about foreign affairs. The good sense, and perhaps in some degree the selfishness, of the nation generally keeps us straight in the long run, but we are always alarming or agitating ourselves about some foreign Power. It would be ridiculous to say that none of our alarms or agitations are well founded, but it is often a mere accident whether they are well founded or not. The only mode of guarding against false alarms and agitations, and of being alive to real dangers, is to understand the subject of which we are speaking. This is very difficult to do thoroughly; but the great thing is to have an honest wish to do it, and to have a settled resolution not to act, and if possible not to talk, until we have been at some pains to examine the existing state of things, and to understand what it is in our power to do to make it better. The Eastern question, for example, is often spoken of as if it were a mere source of possible opportunities of showing off British pluck as against Russian pluck. To Mr. GRANT DUFF the Eastern question is the short name for a variety of complex problems as to the internal politics of Russia and of the Slavonic nations, the relations of Austria to Germany, the decay of the European Turks, and the military systems of two or three great Powers. Unless a man has a fair understanding of all these subjects, his talk about the Eastern question is mere "gas." So, too, the advance of Russia in Central Asia is sometimes considered as a great danger to England and India. There is not one person in a thousand who talks about the advance of Russia in Central Asia with any clear notion of what he means. But Mr. GRANT DUFF and the Elgin burghers really know a great deal about it, and they are of opinion that the advance of Russia in Central Asia, far from being prejudicial to England, is advantageous. This opinion may be right or wrong, but it can only be pronounced right or wrong by those who, like Mr. GRANT DUFF, have patiently and accurately studied the matter with all the best available guides to knowledge.

Mr. GRANT DUFF insists, and as we think very rightly, that this pursuit of knowledge with regard to other countries is a great guarantee for peace. It was the utter ignorance of the French that first hurried them into the war of last year, and that gave them over as sheep to the butcher. Those who know other nations best will be least likely to misjudge them, or to be carried away by pique or prejudice; and the more men feel the value of the intercommunication of knowledge, the more will they hate war as the great obstacle to and destroyer of knowledge. But it must not be supposed that knowledge with Mr. GRANT DUFF means an inability to take part in war with great effect if necessary. On the contrary, knowledge is to be used to give us the best possible army at the least possible cost. How this is to be done he does not pretend to say, but the point which he wishes those whom he addresses to bear in mind as the one of supreme importance is that an intelligent army will cost less and be far cheaper than an unintelligent one. But then how is a knowledge of foreign nations to be acquired? And this brings us to one of Mr. GRANT DUFF's special hobbies. It is of course to be acquired, and is acquired, by a variety of indirect means. Travelling, the study of modern languages, commerce, and engineering all play their part. England, too, has an immense advantage over other nations in the foreign correspondence with which the daily press abounds, and which, with a few exceptions, is excellent. Books of travel, again, and discussions in Parliament are continually teaching something new; and although Englishmen need to learn the lesson which Mr. GRANT DUFF instils into them, they probably are much ahead of other nations in their knowledge of foreign countries. Then there are the writings and speeches of men like Mr. GRANT DUFF who have a special taste and special gifts for picking up information about foreign countries, and all that they have to say adds to the general stock of knowledge. But it takes a good deal to make a man of this kind a trustworthy guide, for he may, if he is not cautious and slightly sceptical, like Mr. GRANT DUFF, stumble into all kinds of pitfalls such as those into which the late Mr. SENIOR passed his life in falling. There is something pathetic in the history of that honest but credulous seeker after knowledge, who thought he was doing a great work by laboriously breakfasting with an endless series of eminent foreign persons, and then solemnly recording the hasty judgments and fallacious prophecies which

they amused themselves with bestowing on him. Really to know a foreign country is a very difficult and laborious matter, and is not to be attained by breakfasts and gossip, although it is not to be attained without them. This is just what Mr. GRANT DUFF urges. We want an instrument of knowledge, and we have it ready at our hand, if we will but use it, in our Diplomatic Service. Mr. GRANT DUFF is most earnest about this, and constantly recurs to it. We have got a very good Diplomatic Service, and we might make it better, and the primary use of this Service ought to be to give information; partly private information to guide the Foreign Secretary and the Ministry, and partly public information to enlighten the public. This conception of a diplomatist as a public servant whose business it is to study the country where he resides, and to let his countrymen have the benefit of his studies, is one which in recent years the Foreign Office has been gradually encouraging. But the English public has not as yet embraced it, and Mr. GRANT DUFF is doing a great service, both to the public and to the Diplomatic Body, by endeavouring to popularize it and attain for it a general acceptance.

THE METROPOLIS WATER ACT.

IN the last hours of the Session a Bill was passed for providing London with a constant supply of water. Its operation will probably be beneficial, though it will in the first instance cause much annoyance and expense to the householders of the metropolis. Occupiers of houses which are sufficiently furnished with cisterns have little reason to trouble themselves with the machinery of supply. As more water than is wanted may be procured by the simple process of turning a cock, they have already, in the ordinary sense of the words, a constant supply, and they seldom inquire whether the service pipes are perpetually charged with water. When the new system is introduced, the cisterns will probably be retained, and, by means of a tap inserted in the pipe, water will be supplied for drinking purposes in a fresher and cooler state. To obtain these advantages consumers will be compelled in the great majority of cases to alter their fittings at a cost which may perhaps amount on an average to a shilling in the pound of one year's rental. In almost all houses the pipes are too weak to bear a constant pressure, and it will be necessary for the security of the Companies against waste to erect waste-pipes in places where they may be seen by the inspector. When the visit of the plumber is at an end, and when his bill is paid, the change will perhaps be considered as worth the expense, but the only persons who are seriously interested in the introduction of a constant supply are the occupiers of the poorer class of houses. The owners of small tenements are seldom inclined to incur any unprofitable outlay; and, as they habitually exact the highest rents which their tenants can afford to pay, any additional expenditure, however essential it may be to health and comfort, is necessarily unremunerative. It is in the receptacles which the poor are compelled to use that the wholesome water supplied from the reservoir becomes rapid and foul; and the mischief will be effectually remedied by the facility of drawing the water direct from the pipe. In one of the poorest districts of London the East London Company have voluntarily provided a large population with a constant supply of a limited but sufficient quantity of water. The new Act includes valuable provisions for enforcing on owners the duty of fitting up their houses to receive a supply. In extreme cases of neglect the nuisance authorities will be bound to close houses without a water supply as unfit for human habitation.

The Companies may at their own discretion substitute constant for intermittent supply in the area traversed by any district main; and after due notice they must comply with the requisition of the Metropolitan Board of Works, or, in the City, of the Corporation. Under the last Metropolitan Water Act, passed in 1852, constant supply might be demanded by four-fifths of the occupiers in any district; but the provisions of the Act were perhaps not generally known, and collective action is not easy in London. The inhabitants of the better class of houses cared and care little for constant supply, and the poor had no means of providing new fittings, even if they had not been at the mercy of their landlords. The remaining portions of the Act have been in the highest degree beneficial. No supply has for many years been taken from the tidal waters of the Thames. All the reservoirs in the neighbourhood of London have been covered, and the whole supply is effectually filtered. The inquiries of the Duke of Richmond's Commission established, not for the first time, the

proposition that the chalk water supplied to London from the Thames, the Lea, the New River, and the Kentish springs is thoroughly wholesome. There is some economic disadvantage in the hardness of the water; but the London water is at least as healthy as that which is supplied to Glasgow or to Manchester. It is indeed a curious fact that medical statistics have uniformly failed to show any relation between purity of water and a sound sanitary condition. Glasgow, with a supply approaching in chemical purity to distilled water, has always been far more unhealthy than Birmingham, where three or four years ago a part of the supply was derived from the adjacent river. Disease is almost invariably produced by water which is contaminated by cess-pools near the point of delivery; but the purity of source apparently concerns the taste and imagination rather than the bodily constitution. Yet the metropolis is fortunate in the enjoyment of water which would be undeniably good if sanitary theorists were not capable of denying anything. The filtered London water is free from all noxious admixture, having undergone a previous filtration through the chalk. The contamination from the towns on the banks of the Thames will shortly be excluded from the river; and the offensive substances are already transformed into harmless shapes before they reach the point of supply. The ignorance which has been confirmed by constant misrepresentation was curiously illustrated by Lord SHAFTESBURY's recent assertion that it was almost impossible to find a pint of wholesome water in London. On the contrary, it would be impossible to find a pint of water supplied by the Companies which is not as wholesome as the best water in the country. Any impurity which may be occasionally found is exclusively attributed to negligence in the domestic management of the cisterns. That the statement was made at random was clearly proved by Lord SHAFTESBURY's further declaration, that the wells to which Londoners formerly resorted have been abandoned on account of their impurity. It is perfectly true that the wells are unwholesome, but the water supply is derived from entirely different sources. If Lord SHAFTESBURY could have been cross-examined, he would probably have admitted that the best possible mode of dealing with the Thames water is to filter it, and to supply it through mains and pipes constantly charged; yet he denounced as useless a Bill which provides additional securities for perfect filtration, while it enforces constant supply. If Lord SHAFTESBURY meant to dispute the fitness of the Thames water for the purpose, he merely offered an arbitrary contradiction to the conclusions of the Royal Commission. The best water which can be obtained for the metropolis, supplied in the best manner known to chemists or engineers, ought, in spite of the dogmatism of a thousand philanthropists, to be accepted with satisfaction. Lord HALIFAX, who had at the time the charge of the Bill on behalf of the Government, had not even the excuse of philanthropic enthusiasm for echoing Lord SHAFTESBURY's blunders. Having probably not even looked at the Bill, nor even thought about water, Lord HALIFAX stated that it was a step in advance, but he added that the Government would be bound to introduce in the next Session a more stringent and comprehensive measure. If Lord HALIFAX should at any time have the curiosity to consult his colleagues on the subject, he will find that they have no purpose of further legislation; and that there is nothing more to legislate about. It is true that the Metropolitan Board of Works entertain a vague desire to purchase the undertakings of the Companies, who on their part would probably be willing to part with their property for a fair price. No transfer of ownership would produce the smallest effect on the mechanical or chemical composition of the water. Lord SHAFTESBURY is a good man, and Lord HALIFAX is a clever man; but benevolence sometimes effervesces into exaggeration, and acuteness is wasted in default of a rudimentary acquaintance with the matter to which it is applied.

Mr. BRUCE and Mr. SHAW LEFEVRE, who introduced the Bill, are in some degree responsible for the clamour which imposed on Lord HALIFAX. In the confusion of fidgety activity with vigour which has threatened so many institutions and affected so few, Mr. BRUCE allowed Mr. LEFEVRE to announce an unjust and impracticable measure, which is naturally contrasted by agitators with the more rational scheme embodied in the Act. It was proposed, amongst other things, that the Companies should be forced by penalties to comply with a chemical test of purity; and the Board of Works was to be authorised, not only to control their operations, but to acquire their undertakings by compulsory purchase. As the sources of supply were already determined, it would have been as absurd to require compliance with an arbitrary standard of purity as to subject miners to penalties because

their ore was deficient in fineness. It was possible to remove by filtration matters held in mechanical suspension, but not to improve the chemical quality of the water. The plan of compulsory sale to a body which was at the same time to have power to depreciate the value of the property by vexatious interference was in the highest degree objectionable. When the maximum dividend is hereafter attained, it may be desirable that any corporate body which may represent the metropolis should purchase the water-works on the basis of the actual income; but as long as there is profit to be gained by improved management the Companies will administer the property as beneficially as a Corporation. It is when shareholders, on the attainment of a maximum dividend, become practically annuitants, that municipal authorities acquire a claim to manage the property of which the future increments belong to their constituents. The Water Act contains stringent provisions for the audit of accounts in the interest of the consumers who have a beneficial interest in a possible surplus. The Board of Trade will appoint the auditors, and it will also decide on questions which may be raised between the Companies and the metropolitan authorities. The judicial attributes of the department are not of a high order, but it possesses the comparative merit of being less incapable than the Home Office. When any department of sanitary and local administration is definitively constituted, it will undoubtedly absorb the more anomalous functions which, in default of a fitter authority, are now entrusted to the Board of Trade.

AN OBJECT IN LIFE.

EVERY ONE who is content with life has, we may take for granted, an object in life. He perhaps—may probably—does not know what it is, and if questioned will be almost certain to hit upon the wrong thing; but an object he has, because existence is not endurable without this stimulus. The popular notion of an object in life is, however, at variance with this universality of the rule. A few persons are rather distinguished from the many by this one characteristic, that they have a mark at which they aim with one continuous unabating endeavour; that is, their object keeps its shape while the object of most people is protean in its changes, retaining however throughout the same nature and indicating the same bias in the mind which dwells on it. The object of such a one is to get on, as it is with the boy who intends to be a bishop; but the weaker nature fluctuates as to the means, and amuses itself with a variety of shadows; the strong will stands by its first choice. It is this persistence that men admire, quite irrespectively of the worth of the thing aimed at. The object may be good or bad, great or contemptible, reasonable or absurd; but if it is pursued with vehement, unflinching obstinacy, the pursuer is ennobled by his tenacity of purpose. The amount of sacrifice is the gauge of heroism. A man who holds to any one idea whatever as the greatest good has to give up much that is held desirable by others. Whether it be Victory or Westminster Abbey, or the regaining a paternal estate by lifelong scraping and drudgery, or the winning of the high-born beauty by the squire of low degree fighting his way to the prize through blood and slaughter, or the recovery of the Moonstone by Mr. Wilkie Collins's three unscrupulous Brahmins, or the pursuit of some subtle scheme of vengeance, or a life-long search after the Philosopher's stone, or the correction of some abuse, or the inculcation of an idea, mere persistence gives dignity to the wildest, the most mischievous, even the meanest object, equally in some minds with the worthiest. So long as it is held distinctly before the eye, and sacrifices are made for it, it is heroic.

Of course where the object is commensurate with a man's highest faculties, and both are of the noblest, a career is grand and edifying. When great spirits hit upon an object which, though above their present powers, is not above their reasonable hopes, "and still their purpose holds" against impediments which would discourage meaner men, we see man almost at his best—not quite perhaps, for then self is lost sight of altogether; but we see the temper which governs men, subdues the world both of matter and mind, and leaves its mark for good on future generations. It is composed of two things which are equally powerful—keen appreciation of the object, and personal ambition. The philosopher loves truth, and pursues it for its own sake, but he also desires to found a school. Dr. Livingstone no doubt feels more strongly than others the importance to the whole human family of exploring the earth's unknown regions, but it is also the object of his life to be himself the successful explorer.

But the objects in life of even the greatest powers and strongest wills are by no means universally of this fitness, and we may see very mean ends pursued by minds of gigantic genius with a distinctness and pertinacity that present a poor and miserable contrast to the moral worth of the object on which these powers are brought to bear. It seems impossible to doubt that Marlborough's object in life was to amass a fortune. He won great victories and he served his country, but neither of these was his absorbing object, not even fame—if, as it seems impossible to doubt, he sacrificed all three to a good round bribe from

France. From youth to age money was his object, and he was not ashamed of it. "Cadogan," he said, turning out a little hoard of broad pieces from his scrutoire and viewing them with visible satisfaction, "observe these pieces well, they deserve to be observed; there are just forty of them. 'Tis the very first *écu* I ever got in my life, and I have kept it always unbroken from that time to this day." Byron's one object beyond the gratifications of sense was not so much poetic fame as to create a sensation and make men stare, to be anyhow in men's mouths; and Swift avowed that his object in life and the root of all his endeavours to distinguish himself were only, for want of a title and fortune, "that I might be used like a lord by those who have an opinion of my parts, whether right or wrong it is no great matter; and so the reputation of great learning does the work of a blue ribbon and a coach and six." And even where not selfish, genius does not preserve men from mistakes in this respect. Walter Scott wrote for an ulterior end. Fame he showed himself almost indifferent to; his object was to found a family, to be father of a line of Scotch lairds. Charles Lamb's object in life was leisure, under the weight of which, when attained, he broke down. Haydon's terribly fixed object was to be an historical painter. Such fixity is fatal when once hope flags,

And after days and months and years of pain,
He finds just lost the object he would gain.

Still, to be vividly conscious of your object is a sign of power, even though it be such a one as Bunyan records as having strongly possessed him in his unconverted state—to have "his bellyful of sin before he died."

But the majority have an object not so easily defined; their tastes are not so developed, their consciousness is feeble, but not the less does all their voluntary action tend to one end. They have one want, though they do not shape it into definite form; they are influenced by one prevailing desire, though we have constantly to find it out for them. For instance, there are really worthy people, respectable in all the relations of life, whose object is to imprint a false impression, on the minds of all the people they converse with, of their social standing and of the quality and position of their intimates. Their mouths are full of fine names, their recollections all affect an intimacy with lords and ladies, or actions of lords and ladies, or at least "county people," while they ignore the less exalted society to which they really appertain and in which their life is passed. A good many benevolent people manifest personal objects in their work of charity of which they have themselves no idea. Collecting money and raising subscriptions amongst your acquaintance is an object with some persons apart from the cause; that is, the business of charity becomes the object. Of course the object of many is management; the making persons bend to your will because it is your will, in the spirit of the good lady who explained her notion of pleasant travelling to be one of a party of fifty and make them all go her way. Some people are known by everybody but themselves to make spending their object. They buy under the notion that they want their purchases, but in reality their object is to get rid of their money. To such people Pope's expression concerning the Duke of Buckingham is applicable, "He got the better of his fine estate," though they may not avow for their profusion the reason given by the spendthrift, that money laid by for three days always stinks.

It has long been settled that happiness is nobody's or next to nobody's object, but, if not happiness, at least amusement is the common object of mankind, though they may have very little perception of what will amuse, and make the constant blunder of mistaking purchased pain for pleasure. Out of the undiscerning mass who blindly go anywhere and do anything that other people tell them, stand out the class gifted with the felicity on which Horace Walpole valued himself, of knowing their own mind. They know what amuses them, and follow it with businesslike pertinacity; whether it be sport or dress or flirting, they devote their powers to it as to the work of life. If company is their pleasure, "their whole heart is taken up with the trivial hope of meeting and being merry." And there is the worthier class who are faithful to an ungrateful hobby through life—music perhaps, for which nature has indifferently qualified them, or gardening without skill, or antiquarianism without knowledge, or pictures without taste, or collecting apart from the science which gives a meaning and dignity to the dead things—the debris and refuse—of nature and time. Whatever it be,

The important nothing takes in life the lead,
And by a coin, a flower, a verse, a boat,
The stagnant spirits have been set afloat.

As a rule, nobody makes his business his object in life; it is only his means towards gaining it, his road to his end. This does not hinder business being the real pleasure and happiness of existence where not tainted by too cruel anxieties; but the occupation of life cannot also be its object, against which indeed it often seems to run counter. Thus nobody can enjoy his business more than Mr. Trollope's breeches-maker, Mr. Neeft, who, rich and prosperous as he is, insists upon measuring his customers himself, in spite of his wife's genteel scruples. Yet Mr. Neeft's object in life is to ally himself with the aristocracy through his daughter, for which he is willing to make the sacrifice, not only of his money, but of that daughter's society for the rest of his days.

There are people who, to all but themselves, do not seem to have either business or object in life, nor any living belongings into whom they may project their failing lives; but unless people

have really nothing to wish for, and are too well off, this is a useless call for pity. The mere impulse of sacrificing the present to the future, of making provision, is almost enough for some natures. Lord Cromarty at fourscore, by merely fixing on a distant object, by retiring to his Scotch home, resolving to lead a thrifty life for six years that he might save up money to spend in London, felt himself young again. And people incapable of this degree of illusion, who know life for what it is—a game they do not enjoy much, though as a game they find its interest last out their time—"like to play their cards well, and to see what will be the end of it."

Novelists treat this question according to their own bias. Those who describe men as they see them do not invest their favourites with a conscious object in life beyond doing their duty and playing their part creditably. They do not set them upon carving out their fortunes. The people with distinguishable objects are the vain, the frivolous, the selfish, the bores of their story; they find it is the weak people who are to be interpreted by their ends. But the novelists who depict society after their own ideal have no sympathy for anybody else. All romance goes on the assumption of an object in life in each conspicuous personage towards which he labours incessantly. Every man has, so to say, his quest. And with didactic fiction it is the same. The hero recognises his work from the first, and does it. It is the same with the novelist whose sympathies go with success and a career; with him genius cannot exist unattached, and in every strong bent he recognises genius, and an assigned place in the scheme of the world. Thus in *Lothair* most people have a definite object in life, to which they consecrate themselves; whether it be Theodora, who announces "I have only one country, and it is not my husband's; I have only one thought, and it is to see it free"—her spirits rising or falling, dying and exulting, as this object thrives or languishes; or Mr. Branceforth, who gives good dinners and is always meditating over the arrangement of his menus, and how to get together the right persons to partake of them; or Mr. Blenkinsop, who was understood to give his mind entirely to croquet, and who kept his sister unmarried because he could not spare her from his favourite pastime; or the manufacturing High Sheriff, who, after a life of struggle, ingenuity, vicissitude, and success, found the object of his life realized when he took precedence with the duchess; or Monsignor Catesby, whose object in life was rich converts to Rome in general, and *Lothair* in particular. *Lothair*, indeed, misses for himself this essential condiment to the most brilliant existence, and fears to drift through life without an orbit. Even in the penultimate chapter he congratulates Lady St. Aldegondo on her modest wish to see Paris. "Well, you have an object, that is something; I have none." But, mindful of the disabilities of her sex, she assures him that men have always an object. They move about and it comes. Of course an object is hard to find for people who have much to lose and little to gain. The readers of Mr. Disraeli's earlier works will recall it as Sidonia's mission to find out humbler merit by the test of definite objects in life. Take the very pretty episode in *Tancred* where he comes upon a family of strollers whose home is a cart, invites the children to dinner after seeing their performances, and extracts from each their master wish, which all had at their fingers' ends. Josephine desired to be an actress; Adele's secret aspirations were for the grand opera; Francis had a more complex longing, "First, that I should travel, and secondly, that nobody should ever know me;" Alfred certainly wished to be a painter; Carlotta at six thought the world was made to dance; and little Michel wished to play the horn. Sidonia here recognised a predisposition which might even be genius, and loved to give ability of all kinds its scope and its chance. It is the success of people who know their bent and follow it with tenacity which imparts such cheerfulness of tone to Mr. Disraeli's novels. His people all know what they are about and stick to their purpose.

But fortunately an object in life does not necessitate this working towards it. Often it is a simple point for expectation, like the annuitant's quarter-day, a still recurring object wreathing the brow of flying Time with roses. As men grow past the working hours of life their objects take this holiday character. They are interested to watch and wait like Andrew Fairservice. For there is always "something to saw that they would like to see sawn; or something to maw that they would like to see mawn; or something to ripe that they would like to see ripen, and so they dalker on" cheerfully to the year's end.

MONUMENTAL AND DOCUMENTARY EVIDENCE.

WHETHER the present age seeks for sermons in stones or not, it is certain that a good many inquirers are seeking, and with good reason, for history in stones. Some of the most famous cities of the earth are being grubbed up from their foundations in order to bear their witness to the truth or falsehood of their received history. Not only our own Wroxeter, not only mysterious Nineveh, but cities whose name fills the world in all ages, like Rome and Jerusalem, are thus made to give as a record of their early days—a record which we may easily misconstrue, but which itself can never lie. In these two points consists the special character of what seems to be distinguished as archaeological evidence from the evidence of tradition and written records. Let it be marked at the outset that we place tradition and written records together. Some might perhaps be inclined to place traditional and archaeological evidence together in opposi-

tion to written records. But this would be to mistake the accidents for the substance. Archaeological, or, as we may perhaps better call it, monumental evidence, is the evidence of the objects themselves, as distinguished from the evidence of the men who make statements about them. This kind of evidence is matter of inference. From the character of the building or other object, and from its character alone, without reference to external testimony of any kind, something is inferred as to the age and authorship of the monument. It is true, as we shall presently see, that all evidence of this kind is in its beginning grounded on documentary evidence, but, at the moment of its application in each particular case, documentary evidence does not come in. The object may have no recorded history of any kind, but from certain signs in the thing itself some of the facts of its history are inferred. And these facts may be of two kinds, one of which needs technical knowledge to make the required inference, while the other does not. Thus, if a wall has a seam or break in the masonry, a keen eye, without any historical knowledge of architecture, will be able to see which part of the wall is built up against the other, and thereby which is the older of the two. But to judge from the nature of the masonry, or from any feature in the architectural detail, how much older the one is than the other, is a matter of technical knowledge; mere keenness of eye is not enough. Now we repeat that this technical knowledge is in the first instance grounded on documentary evidence. Our point is that the documentary evidence has no direct share in the particular examination. The date or other circumstances of the monument are inferred from the monument itself, without turning to any book or asking the oldest inhabitant what may be the local tradition.

Inference of this kind is archaeological or monumental evidence in the strictest sense. When testimony other than that of the monuments themselves comes in, we have got into another region. If we can compare either a written record or an unwritten tradition with the monumental evidence, a new line of argument is at once opened. It is here that we must insist on the position that the unwritten tradition and the written record are evidence exactly the same in kind, though varying infinitely in degree. People do not seem always to take in that the difference between tradition and history is simply a difference in degree. The difference in degree is so very wide that it seems as if it were more than a difference in degree, and amounted to a difference in kind. Yet every record of the past depends in the first instance on the personal testimony of some one or other. The difference in value between one record and another consists in the greater chances which one form of record supplies rather than another for the accurate preservation of the original testimony. The highest form is when the fact was recorded at once, especially if it was recorded in an official shape. The lowest is when it has passed verbally from mouth to mouth through many generations. But between these two extremes there is every variety of intermediate stage, and it is hard to say at what point the line between history and tradition is to be drawn. During long periods of history we have mainly to trust to narratives written at or near the time by eye-witnesses or men who had talked with eye-witnesses. This is a high form of evidence, but not the highest. During other periods we have to trust to a much lower form of evidence, to the writings of men who had before them earlier writings which are now lost. But the difference between any of these forms of evidence, from the official record to the vaguest verbal tradition, is simply a difference in degree; all alike profess and endeavour to preserve a true record of what has happened, though the degrees of efficacy among the means of preservation differ infinitely, and all form one class as opposed to the evidence of the monuments themselves.

Now these two forms of evidence may be in certain cases interchanged, as it were, in a curious manner. A monument may supply evidence which is not monumental evidence. A building, for instance, may be marked with an inscription recording its date and builder. In this case we do not make any inference from the character of the building itself. Our knowledge comes from an external record. We read the history of the building on the building itself, as we might read it anywhere else. The process is exactly the same as if we read the story in a book, only the degree of authority belonging to the record is much higher. In the like sort, a written record itself may supply evidence of the monumental kind, as when experts infer the date of a manuscript from the handwriting or the language without any reference to the matter of the writing itself. In this latter case the inference is made by exactly the same process as that by which we infer the date of a building from the character of the masonry or of the architectural details.

But again, as we have before said, the monumental species of evidence really resolves itself into the evidence of written records. We know that a building belongs to a certain age by the character of its architecture. We know that a manuscript belongs to a certain age by the character of its writing. But it is only from the evidence of records that we learn that such or such forms of architecture and writing may be referred to a certain age. Take the case of buildings. The dates of certain buildings are recorded, and by a comparison of the buildings which are recorded to belong to a certain age we get a knowledge of the general characteristics of the buildings of that age. We then argue from the known to the unknown, and refer to the same age those buildings which show the same characteristics, but of which the dates are unrecorded. This process is the groundwork of all architectural chronology. A keen eye starting from this point will, by examin-

ing building after building, find out a vast deal more, and will learn to date buildings with a precision to which no documentary evidence could ever guide him; still it was documentary evidence alone which enabled him to take his first step in discovery.

The fact that monumental evidence is thus in its own nature secondary, that it rests on a series of inferences which start in the first instance from documentary evidence, should always be borne in mind. Yet, for most practical purposes, monumental and documentary evidence may be treated as two distinct sources of knowledge which have constantly to be compared with one another. Professor Willis, for instance, has access to a series of documents recording the changes which have taken place in this or that church. He compares the entries in the documents with the appearances of the building itself, and when the documents fail him, the appearances themselves help him out. He is thus able to frame from these two sources together a complete history of the building which he could not have done either from the documents only or from the building only. In this case it is hardly an exaggeration to say that the result reaches absolute certainty; but there are many researches essentially the same in kind where we cannot venture to assert so undoubtingly that we have reached the right conclusion. Thus researches into primeval antiquities must, for the most part, be carried on without any documentary help whatever. No Gervase ever recorded the setting up of a cromlech. In primeval matters our only chance is to light on some incidental reference, most likely in some writer distant in time and place, and the application of whose words is commonly open to dispute. Such are the passages in the classical writers which have been thought to refer to Stonehenge. Except where we have contemporary history, all our references are of this kind. In some cases we have to make our scanty monumental and our scanty documentary evidence in a manner support one another. For instance, the remains of Mykéné certainly help to confirm the authority of the Homeric poems; not of course in detail, but in the general description of a state of things such as we could never have guessed from later history, a state of things in which Mykéné was the dominant power of Greece. Something of the same sort may possibly happen in the case of the researches at Rome, but it is a line of argument which must be used only with very great caution. We have, for instance, heard it said that a great deal has been brought to light which goes far to prove the truth of the narrative in the first book of Livy. We do not as yet know the details, and we do not wish as yet to know, because we wish to make some remarks upon the mode of investigation at first starting. What is meant by confirming the truth of the first book of Livy? It can hardly mean that any Roman monument has been found which confirms the story of the landing of Æneas or of the birth of Romulus. Does it simply mean that the monumental evidence confirms the belief that there was a regal period at Rome, and that some of the later kings were the doers of great works in the way of buildings? This last, we believe, nobody ever doubted. Probably it is meant that the monuments and the legend go together in those points in which the legend was almost sure to preserve a true tradition; either form of evidence by itself would be almost enough to convince us that the Rome of historical times was formed by the union of several distinct settlements. In short, the monuments and the legend combined may give us about the degree of knowledge which Greek monuments and Greek legend together give us of the pre-historic state of Mykéné and Tiryns; but this is a very different matter from proving the truth of the first book of Livy. The first book of Livy is a detailed narrative, with minute accounts of persons and events, and a kind of chronology to boot. It is a narrative written ages after the events which it professes to relate, from authorities which did not themselves profess to be contemporary. It is hard to see how the monuments of the earliest times can help us to names, dates, and particular events, though they may easily help us to general views as to the earliest state of things at Rome, and those general views may easily be the same as those which, without the monuments, we might be led to look upon as the residuum of truth in the legends.

In fact, no process can be more delicate than that of comparing monumental and written evidence when the written evidence is not contemporary; even when it is, our historical notices are often so vague and untechnical that it needs great care and experience in fixing on the existing works to which the record refers. Such a narrative as that of Gervase stands almost by itself. Than such a narrative as his only one authority can be higher, that of a contemporary inscription on the building itself.

In all these inquiries, when we bring monumental and written evidence to be compared together, we must remember the strong and the weak points of each kind of evidence. As we said at the beginning, strictly monumental evidence cannot lie, but its interpretation may easily be mistaken. On the other hand, written evidence is less likely to be misunderstood, but it is always possible that it may lie. The records which we have to compare with monuments are liable to the same imperfection as all other records. They may be affected by the corruption of copyists, by the ignorance, the carelessness, the deliberate invention, of the original writers. But there is one form of record which is free from most of these sources of error—that is, inscriptions on the monuments themselves. An inscription saying that such a building was built by such a man at such a time may commonly be trusted as proof that it was built by such a man at such a time. In such a case there is no room for ignorance and carelessness, and deliberate invention would need such boundless impudence that it is not

likely to be often ventured on. A monumental inscription is a public record of the very highest class; but even here we must bear in mind what public records prove and what they do not. A monumental inscription is the best possible authority for names, titles, and dates, but if it goes beyond this range—if it goes on to tell us of the motives, the virtues, the victories of the prince who set it up or in whose honour it was set up—it falls to the level of ordinary paper and ink, and we claim our right to use our independent judgment.

Of all kinds of evidence none would seem, within its own range, to be so perfect as that supplied by coins. A coin is at once a monument and a record. It is a record inscribed on a substance whose nature makes it serve as a monument, and which is moreover capable of multiplication in a way in which other monuments are not. Yet even this kind of evidence has its weak side; none is so trustworthy, when it is genuine; but there is none which has been so largely counterfeited. And again, the evidence of coins, like other evidence, is good only within its own range. When we find the title and arms of France used for some centuries on the coins of England, we have distinct evidence that a claim of some sort over France was asserted by the Kings of England, and we are aroused to find out from other sources what this claim meant and how it began. But a man would go very far wrong indeed if he were to infer from this piece of numismatic pretension that the Kings of England did, during all that time, exercise any real authority over France. Used with this caution before our eyes, there is no sort of evidence more clear and more trustworthy, and which tells its own tale in a more lively way, than that supplied by the coinage of a country. In one famous case, that of the Bactrian Kings, the history of a whole dynasty has been recovered from its coinage. And to come nearer home, there could be no more speaking lesson in political history than that which some years back was supplied by a handful of French money. No document, no inscription, seems to bring history so nearly home to us as when we thus find it graven on the most needful objects of daily life.

KNOLE.

PEOPLE who shrink from a run round the world can find, like Xavier de Maistre, a good deal to amuse them in "a journey round their chamber," and the Londoner who is tired of being mobbed along the Rhine or fleeced in the Grindelwald has only to take an hour's ride out of town to light upon one of the loveliest of English parks, and one of the most picturesque of English country houses. Much, no doubt, of the charm of Knole lies in its surroundings; the air is always fresh and keen on the high ground of Sevenoaks; the country round is a succession of fine parks and wild, fern-clad commons; everywhere there is a look of the forest in the abundance of oak and beech and breaks of rougher country dark with firs, while height after height gives one wide views over the vast reach of the Weald of Kent as far as the Sussex Downs. The country is rich and prosperous, dotted with villages full of old timbered homesteads, and gables rough with curious devices in plaster; with churches of no great note architecturally, but interesting from their brasses and tombs of knight and lady side by side at rest; with quaint mediæval manor-houses like Igham Moat, or modern houses like Chevening, ugly enough in themselves, but linked to our history by memories of Chatham or Camden. But Knole seems to sum up in itself the beauty and interest of the district around it. Artists haunt the place, as they well may do, and revel in the glades of its park, its marvellous beeches, the long oak avenue, the sweeps of bracken with the deer asleep in the sunshine. Even Walpole kindled into enthusiasm a hundred years ago at the sight of the great sycamore beside the gate-house, the tree "which makes one more in love than ever with sycamores." The house itself stands in the midst of the park, untouched by later alterations, and still in substance what Archbishop Bourchier left it in the fifteenth century, save for its Jacobean gables and gilded vanes sparkling amongst the tree-clumps. Few spots are richer in names and associations of the past. The manor had belonged to the patriot William Mareschal and the infamous Fulk de Breauté, before it passed to the family which Shakespeare has made familiar to us in the Lord Saye who figures in the rebellion of Jack Cade, and which derives its odd title of Saye and Sele from the village of Sele, a few miles off. The names of the archiepiscopal owners, Bourchier, Morton, and Warham, are notable in the history of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, and its subsequent possession by the house of Dorset has associated it with the annals of English literature. The first earl was the Lord Buckhurst, who wrote the *Mirror of Magistrates*, and originated the Elizabethan drama by his tragedy of *Gorbudoc*. The portraits still preserved in the Poet's Gallery recall the poets of the Restoration who gathered, from Dryden to D'Urfey, round the table of the last earl, the well-known patron of Prior.

So far as its fabric is concerned, Knole House remains, as we have said, substantially as the Archbishops left it, and few buildings bring home more forcibly the wealth and position of the Primates during the century which preceded the Reformation. From the days of Stephen Langton to those of Crammer their ecclesiastical and political dignity had undoubtedly declined. The presence of Legates *a latere* in the realm, the immediate dependence of the religious orders on the Papal See, and their consequent exemption from the archiepiscopal jurisdiction, and, above all, the growing frequency of appeals from the Archiepiscopal Courts to the Roman Curia,

had stripped much of its spiritual importance from the chair of St. Augustine. On the other hand, the establishment and growth of the English Parliament had at once superseded the Archbishops in their constitutional function as representatives of law and custom and the popular rights against the lawless tyranny of our earlier kings. Much of their older power returned with the Reformation. The severance from Rome, the prohibition of appeals to the Papal Courts, again placed the Primates at the head of the Church of England; while their position as directors of the Ecclesiastical Commission gave them a direct and effective power over the clergy such as no Archbishop had possessed since the days of Theodore. A glance at their names illustrates easily enough the change in their position. There are few people who could not run off the list of primates from Lanfranc to Langton, or the after-list from Crammer to Laud, but we fancy few even among professed historians would like to commit themselves to a statement of the prelates who fill up the interval. Some, like Sudbury or Arundel, were undoubtedly men of no little ability; the later Primates occupied a high political rank as Ministers of the Crown. But their own distinctive position was for the time utterly gone, and for two centuries the Archbishops sink into great nobles and land-owners. It was a time during which the value of all landed estates rose enormously, and the wealth of the see of Canterbury, if we may judge of it from the sums spent by its possessors on their houses in Kent, must have become enormous. In addition to the palace at Canterbury and their London manor-house at Lambeth, the last of which owes all its older work to this period, the Archbishops possessed sixteen great estates in Kent alone, and some of these, such as Maidstone, Wrotham, and Otford, were adorned with dwellings which can hardly have been inferior in magnificence to Knole. On Otford, indeed, which stood hardly two miles from Knole, Warham expended 30,000*l.* on the eve of the Reformation. But only one ivy-clad tower and a few broken walls remain to tell of the glories of Otford, while Knole remains utterly untouched. The site was acquired and the house built by Archbishop Bourchier, and the grandeur of his plans is shown in the extent of ground—between four and five acres, we believe—which it covers. No portion, however, of the present front belongs to the original edifice. The fine gate-house is probably due to Archbishop Morton, the founder of the yet grander gate-house at Lambeth, while the row of Elizabethan buildings which flank it on either side, somewhat to the injury of its architectural effect, are the work of the first Lord Buckhurst. Bourchier's own gate-tower divides the outer court which these buildings form from the inner court which leads to the hall, and its pretty oriel, inserted quaintly in the machicolations above it, has a picturesque effect which is somewhat wanting in the rest of the building. The great barn which flanks the stable-court is of the same date, and brings home to us the domestic economy of the great households of the fifteenth century, their rents in kind, and the flocks of retainers who ate their way in their master's train from manor to manor. The chapel, with its large perpendicular window, belongs, like the kitchen, to Bourchier's building, and if the original woodwork of the roof is still in existence, it would be well to do away with the modern plaster-work which at present occupies its place.

Of the means by which this magnificent seat was wrested from the Archbishops a curious record exists in the defence of Crammer by his secretary Morice against the charge that he had diminished by his prodigal surrenders to Henry VIII. the resources of his see. "As touching the exchanges," urges the secretary, "men ought to consider with whom he had to do; especially with such a Prince as would not be bridled nor be gainsaid in any of his requests unless men would danger altogether. I was by when Otford and Knol were given him. My Lord, minded to have retained Knol unto himself, said that it was too small a house for His Majesty. 'Marry,' said the King, 'I had rather have it than this house' (meaning Otford), 'for it standeth on a better soil. This house standeth low, and is rheumatic, like unto Croydon, where I could never be without sickness. And as for Knol, it standeth on a sound, perfect, wholesome ground; and if I should make abode there, as I do surely mind to do now and then, I will live at Knol, and most of my house shall live at Otford.' And so by this means both those houses were delivered up into the King's hands." We commend the scene to Mr. Froude for a future edition of his work; the English hero whom he has sketched with so loving a pen rivals in Mr. Morice's story the greed and oppression of a Turkish pasha. It was, in fact, a mere wanton spirit of robbery which drove Crammer from his much-loved dwelling-house. Knole was never occupied by Henry, and passed on lease from one favourite of the Crown to another, till it was granted by Elizabeth to her Treasurer Lord Buckhurst, in whose family it has remained to the present day. The interior of the house belongs to the Sackvilles, as the exterior for the most part belongs to the Archbishops. The whole air of the place is of the seventeenth century; no modern changes have been suffered to intrude into its long narrow galleries, with their walls covered with portraits and their windows glowing with armorial bearings; its small chambers elaborately panelled, or hung with Flemish tapestry; its embayed windows looking out on formal gardens; its ebony cabinets, its embroidered chairs. Most of the furniture dates from the period of the Stuarts, and is as beautiful as it is curious. Those who believe, from a cursory knowledge of high-backed seats, that our grandmothers were more independent of comfort than

their later descendants, will be amazed at the store of easy chairs with every possible appliance for comfort which they will find at Knole. The store of tapestry from the looms of Flanders and Mortlake, only a part of which is commonly shown to visitors, is almost endless, and some of it is of the highest artistic excellence. A large proportion of the portraits undoubtedly deserve Walpole's sneer, "They seem to have been bespoke by the yard and drawn all by the same painter"; but a few admirable Vandycks, one or two Gainsboroughs, and a large number of works by Reynolds, redeem the collection as a whole from the charge of mediocrity.

The eighty staircases, the endless labyrinth of rooms and passages which we find at Knole, are in themselves the best illustrations of the social life and position of the great nobles of the Tudor and Elizabethan periods. "My Lord's household," with its hundred of retainers, its grooms and footmen, yeomen and ushers, its pages and attendants, its chaplains and "my Lord's favourite," formed almost a little army in itself. It was easy, out of the scores of serving-men around him, for a great peer to equip his troop of horse and plunge into treason or civil war. The numbers of his household, even the pomp and observance which distinguished his table and service, turned the family of a great nobleman into a petty Court, and isolated him from the lower orders of the State. Few social changes are more remarkable than the silent revolution which has altered the whole tone of aristocratic life in the curtailment of these vast households. Knole, as it stands now, is big enough to contain the families of three or four of our modern noblemen, and the stately galleries of presence, the hall and the Royal chambers, are abandoned as a show to sight-seers. The social change in the position of our peers has been aided to no small extent by their own personal character. As a rule they have been content with the position of great landowners, and have left the political influence which as a class they might have wielded to a small minority of their order. It is curious, in tracing the lines of the greater English families, to note how few have concerned themselves, whether from want of will or want of ability, with the active administration of the State. Of the Earls and Dukes of Dorset, the first owner of Knole, Queen Elizabeth's Treasurer, is the only one who ever occupied any great political position. Nor do the Sackvilles stand alone in this. Believers in hereditary ability will find it hard to explain why not a single Cecil has emerged from obscurity in the interval between Burleigh and his son and the present Marquis of Salisbury, or why no Marquis of Winchester has ever appeared on the stage of history since the days of Henry VIII. But the truth is that in this comparative obscurity lies the safety of the English peerage. If intellectual activity were added to their great social position and their immense wealth, a conflict with the middle classes would become inevitable. Had they even been gathered round a Court, like the French noblesse of the older Monarchy, their order must have become a mark for envy and hatred. Their pride, their independence of the Crown, their aversion from politics, their love of country life, a certain commonplace type of character, has saved them, by reducing them for the most part to the rank of big landowners, hardly distinguishable save by a few social privileges from the general mass of country gentlemen around them. This may not be the position which Mr. Disraeli, in his earlier days of enthusiasm desired for the nobility of England. But it is a position which will probably enable them to weather democratic storms in which the noblesse of the Continent have gone down. Wealth, too, in their hands may take a refinement and grace which will be a corrective to the rougher sort of influence which it exercises in the hands of the commercial classes. The sentiment of antiquity, the instinctive reverence for the past, will always throw a certain charm and picturesqueness over great patrician houses like that of Knole.

THE ROYAL SCIENCE SCHOOL AND THE SCHOOL OF MINES.

ONE of the first practical suggestions of the Royal Commission on Scientific Instruction and the Advancement of Science presented in March last was the transference from the Museum in Jermyn Street of the Royal School of Mines, and from Oxford Street of the Royal College of Chemistry, the two to be consolidated as a branch of the portentous general scheme to be established at South Kensington under the comprehensive title of the "Science School." The plea under which this proposed change was set forth in the Report was, in the main, that "the School of Mines and College of Chemistry, which practically constitute one school of pure and applied science, are not so organized as to enable them to perform efficiently the work for which they were originally, or are at present, intended." This conclusion is made to rest upon three grounds—the want of a Chair of Mathematics; the absence of Physical or Biological Laboratories in which students can receive practical instruction; and the insufficiency of accommodation in the Royal College of Chemistry. It was further urged that the officers of the Geological Survey, which had for years been carried on in the Jermyn Street building, had become greatly hindered in their work by want of accommodation, their number having been quintupled during the last twenty years, while the space originally allotted to them remained the same. The Mining Record Office was described as similarly cramped for room, the collections

in the Museum of Practical Geology also requiring greater space for their proper display. Under the new scheme propounded in the Report, the Geological Survey, which, it is urged, has no necessary connexion with the Royal School of Mines, would have undivided possession of the building in Jermyn Street; the Museum, however, being still retained there, and the lectures to working-men in the theatre continued as heretofore. The Mining Record Office would be lodged with the Statistical Department of the Board of Trade; or, failing accommodation there, in the building in Oxford Street to be vacated by the Royal College of Chemistry. The Report concluded with sundry recommendations with which we are less concerned at present, touching a projected School of Naval Architecture and Science, the buildings for which are nearly completed at South Kensington; within which the New School of Science should find a domicile, and the whole be incorporated in one; the general instruction in mathematics, physical science, and mechanical drawing being common to the two Schools, and sufficient laboratories and other aids being provided for the practical teaching of physics, chemistry, and biology.

An energetic protest against this threatened process of happy despatch was addressed by officers or Professors of the Royal School of Mines, four in number, to the Director, Sir Roderick Murchison, and forwarded by him for the consideration of the Committee of the Privy Council on Education, backed by his strenuous opinion, frequently impressed before this upon their lordships, that its continued connexion with the Geological Survey and Museum was most essential to the success of the School of Mines, which would utterly lose its "mining character" by being moved from its present central position and absorbed in a general "College of Science." The four Professors—Mr. Warrington Smyth, Dr. Ramsay, Dr. Percy, and Mr. Hunt—to whose names both in their individual and collective capacity no words of ours could add weight, give sober and strongly-grounded reasons against the practical suppression of their functions. Without going the length of their venerable chief as to the necessary connexion between the direction of the Geological Survey and the School of Mines, they hold it to be indisputable that, considering the special object for which the School was established, the direct association of the two institutions has been attended with great practical advantage. The object of the Geological Survey is the investigation of the nature and extent of the mineral resources of the country; and the object of the Royal School of Mines is to teach how those resources may be most scientifically, and therefore most efficiently and most economically, developed. Were the projected transfer of the School of Mines carried out, there would arise the obvious necessity of a new and duplicate Museum, with corresponding expense for collection and management. Without such a collection of ores, fossils, and models, no teacher of mining or metallurgy would deem it feasible to enter upon a course of instruction; and it is more than doubtful whether anything like the collection amassed during twenty years and more, with infinite pains and no slight cost, by the present eminent head of the Metallurgical Department, Dr. Percy, could ever be brought together *de novo*. Nor is it true, the Professors are entitled to plead, that chemistry is excluded from the course of the School of Mines and Metallurgy. What is metallurgy itself but a branch of chemistry applied to one definite or special line of study and practice? More than one laboratory for the instruction and use of students forms part of the existing arrangement of the School, and such slight increase of accommodation as might be needed for its thorough efficiency might be obtained at an insignificant expense. The Commissioners' complaint of want of room is indeed amply rebutted by the evidence of the local staff. The Lecturer on Mining and Mineralogy is perfectly contented with the space at present allotted to him. No extra space is sought for by the Lecturer on Geology as such, while the slight increase required by him as Director of the Geological Survey might be provided at small expense in the immediate vicinity of the collections which have to be constantly consulted. As for a Biological laboratory or school, the Commissioners' recommendation is dismissed with the just remark that in no Mining School in the world has biology ever been held to form part of the course of instruction. No necessary connexion exists between the subjects. Neither is the value of a mathematical groundwork ignored by the Professors. All they urge is that such elementary training as is needed for this special course is, as a rule, brought by students at the age at which they enter. The object of the Mining School is not to turn out professors of universal science, or speculative students armed with the entire apparatus of physical inquiry. What it was designed to effect, and what has been done by the juxtaposition of the geological maps and collections, mining plans, statistical documents, mining models, and metallurgical laboratory, is to raise and equip a staff of pupils practically versed in the functions of mining engineers. The institution in its present form has been reported on by eminent and competent visitors from various parts of Europe and America as a classical example, whereas prior to its creation no such School existed in England, and a knowledge of these subjects had to be sought from distant Academies abroad.

In reply to this highly effective defence, the sub-Committee of three deputed by the general body of Commissioners—Mr. Samuelson, Dr. Sharpey, and Mr. H. J. S. Smith—have nothing for it but to fall back upon the foregone opinion or *πρόρον ψήδος*, that the "consolidation of the school" is of more importance than the contiguity of the various departments and the col-

lections belonging thereto; this consolidation being only feasible in Jernyn Street by means of immense expense, whereas South Kensington, as all the world knows, has unlimited space for any agglomeration of objects and inventions whatever. Obligated to admit the force of the argument that teachers should have at command the suitable and extensive collections of the Museum of Practical Geology, they simply cannot "allow it to outweigh the considerations referred to above, on which the decision of the Commission has been based." They make a sort of case out of the specimens belonging to the Museum being "very rarely exhibited in the lecture-rooms," ignoring the fact that many specimens are of a nature to suffer from manipulation, whilst others, as in the case of many of the models, are of a bulk to forbid easy handling or transport, yet all are within easy reach for immediate reference. With a queer want of consistency, they seek to make out that one or more collections on a smaller scale would amply meet the wants of lecturers in the new School. What they clearly rely on as their most potent shot is the charge of inefficiency in the existing School. "The Committee have to state that for the last eighteen years the average number of students who, having been examined in mining and mineralogy, have subsequently been employed in the Geological Survey, and in the mines and metal works of the United Kingdom, has, according to a table put in evidence, been less than four per annum." That the mining interest should have been thus slow to avail itself of the School, notwithstanding the eminence of the Professors, is an evident sign to their eyes of the imperfection of its organization, especially due to the absence of mathematics. This imperfection they would rectify by the proposed association of the School with that of Naval Architecture and Marine Engineering. Now we are at a loss whether to ascribe it to a want of candour or of due inquiry on the part of the framers of this Report, that we find no heed taken here of the vastly greater number of students who have studied and qualified in the separate branches of science without going through the wider course or competing for the general distinctions implied in the Associateship. We may add that a glance at the examination papers given in the same return would have shown chemistry, mineral and organic, theoretical and practical, to be the subject of the very first and most searching questions. The syllabus of lectures and laboratory practice proves the completeness with which every head of chemical inquiry is incorporated with the School course; while it is expressly laid down that the laboratories are used for the instruction of the pupils of the Royal School of Mines, the fundamental studies in practical chemistry being the same for all, until the student diverges at length into his special line of work. It is difficult to conceive a system which could more adequately come up to the model had in view by the representatives of the mining interest, at whose instance the School of Mines was set on foot in 1851. It has come to be to Britain all that the Bergakademie of Freiberg and the École des Mines of Paris are to Germany and France.

In his speech in moving an address in reference to this subject in the House of Lords, on the 11th of July last, Lord Salisbury spoke of South Kensington as that bourn to which it was the seeming destiny of all scientific humanity to be removed, and spoke, too, of the "terrible shriek of despair" which the prospect of such a doom had drawn from the officers of the Royal School of Mines. His urgency has, we understand, succeeded in obtaining a pledge on the part of the Government that no immediate step shall be taken in the matter. Time and closer study of the bearings of the case will, we would hope, save an institution, the practical working of which has been so thoroughly vindicated, from summary absorption into that omnivorous maw which, for aught we see, may with as much reason proceed to gulp down Oxford, Cambridge, Edinburgh, or London. We are not ourselves of the number of those who merely read in this notable scheme just the old story of South Kensington encroachment or monopoly. Our attention has been in more instances than one drawn to a scheme not less aggrandizing in ambition or pretensions in scope. A gigantic Governmental system, in which Universal Science should be taught with authority, and chairs of imposing solemnity be provided for men of the stamp which the State or the Court delighteth to honour, would be a fitting complement, if not a formidable rival, to such collections of dubious art and bric-a-brac as already embody and enforce the official code of taste in the galleries of South Kensington. There is, we know, a sectica of our scientific men to whom the Institute of France, with its array of official names, its voice like an oracle of truth, its shrines sacred from the feet of innovators or outsiders, forms the ideal of what the culture of nature should be. And this Imperial palace or college of science would be as nothing while some little Naboth's vineyard of practical and independent work outside remained unabsorbed within its mighty compass. No matter that the Royal School of Mines can point to a score of years of conscientious work, and to hundreds of trained miners, assayers, metallurgists, usefully working at home or in the colonies; such labours are too humble, too unsystematic, too like the old jog-trot, common-sense British way of doing things, to stand by the side of grandly organized, encyclopedic, Continental models of perfection. The great phronetistion stands ready. Its gates will shortly be opened for neophytes in every branch of knowledge. Its chairs are already, we have little doubt, marked with the names of favoured hierophants. Universal science will be proclaimed with plenary wisdom and authority. But for the

practical interests which have been so well secured by the limited but efficient staff in Jernyn Street, we see little else than loss in the uprooting or suppression of the Royal School of Mines.

THE NINE HOURS' MOVEMENT.

THE engineers of Newcastle have now been on strike for three months, and as they persist in refusing the terms offered by the masters, and as the latter have declared that they will not make any further concessions, there is no immediate prospect of the struggle being brought to a close. The chief industry of an important manufacturing district is thus completely paralysed, and the operatives can enjoy the malicious satisfaction of reflecting that the sufferings they have inflicted on themselves and their families have been accompanied by heavy, and in some cases, ruinous losses to their employers. The ostensible object of the strike is to enforce a demand put forward on behalf of the men by the "Nine Hours' League," that in future the hours of labour shall not exceed nine a day. When this proposal was first made there was a good deal of talk about the importance of allowing the working-man more leisure for cultivating his mind and practising the domestic virtues in the midst of his family. It must be observed, however, that the working-men who are so anxious for this ennobling leisure are by no means prepared to pay for it. Nothing is said about wages, but it is implied that the week's wages shall remain the same as at present while the hours of labour are reduced. The practical effect of the demand, if the masters agreed to it, would therefore be that they would have to pay the men so much more for every hour they worked, and that they would have to engage a larger number of men if they desired to maintain the usual rate of production in their establishments. At first the employers refused to communicate personally with the League, and the League refused to have anything to say to the firm of solicitors to whom they were referred for an answer. The strike occurred just before the race-week, when there is usually a lull in the factories, and it was supposed that when the holidays were over the operatives, tired of spending money and earning none, would be glad to accept a compromise proposed by the masters to strike off two hours a week and would return to work. The factories were thrown open, but no operatives entered them. Scotch and Belgian workmen were then brought to Newcastle, but the "pickets" contrived to get hold of them, and, partly by argument, but chiefly by intimidation and incessant persecutions, drove them away. The Criminal Offences Act of last Session was passed just in time to be enforced against the pickets, but as the new comers were lodged in the same quarters and sometimes in the same houses as the men on strike, it was found to be impossible to afford them adequate protection. The masters have therefore been compelled to provide special accommodation for them inside or in the immediate neighbourhood of the works; but even now they are exposed to constant annoyance, and even barbarous assaults, when they appear out of doors. One of the artisans, who spoke at a meeting on the town-moor on Saturday last, warned his fellows against the savage disposition of the Russians and other foreigners, and threatened retaliation in a manner which suggested that it might be as well to begin at once and not lose time waiting for the foreigners to set the example. A few days afterwards the imported workmen at Hawthorn's factory on their way back from dinner were set upon by the mob and stoned. We have here a significant illustration of Trade-Unionist conceptions of international amity and freedom of labour.

It is impossible to observe the circumstances under which the Newcastle strike originated, the manner in which it has been carried on, and the organized agitation which has been got up throughout the country to encourage and support it, as well as to prepare for an extension of the movement, without coming to the conclusion that this is not a mere isolated local dispute between men and masters in a particular trade. The fact is, that during the last year or two the Unions have been rather under a cloud. They were discredited by the horrible disclosures at Sheffield, Manchester, and elsewhere, and they have also suffered in the estimation not only of the public at large, but of a considerable section of the working classes, by the open and infatuated co-operation of Union delegates and secretaries with the political conspirators of the International Association. Probably the Unionist leaders were only partially aware of the projects in which their foreign friends were engaged, were dazzled and bewildered by their high-flown jargon about the regeneration of peoples, and were, in fact, made the unconscious tools of abler and less scrupulous men than themselves. The intimacy, however, has done harm to the Unionist cause, and especially to the grand design at which the leaders have been for some time labouring to bring the various bodies under the control of a central administration in London, which would thus wield an enormous influence in political as well as industrial matters. Moreover, the representatives of the Unions have signally failed at all the Parliamentary elections in which they have offered themselves as candidates. Nor have they been so successful as they had hoped in persuading Parliament to grant immunity for Unionist outrages. The two Acts of last Session carry concession as far as justice will admit, but Professor Beesly is horrified to discover that coercion is still a criminal offence. The civil courts have also been brought to bear against the practices of the Unions. In a recent case the Judge ruled that men have a right to combine to protect their own interests, but not to injure other people. A

man employed in a glass-bottle manufactory, who had had some difference with the Union, was driven from his place by a joint representation to the employer on the part of the Unionists in the shop, that if he did not discharge the "knobstick" they would leave in a body. They had threatened their victim that "he should be kicked out like a dog," and the master admitted that he had dismissed him under compulsion. On the Judge's ruling, a verdict, with 300*l.* damages, was returned for the injured man. Under these circumstances it has apparently been deemed necessary to do something "to put heart" into the Unionists, if we may borrow the term applied to the very similar process in which Mr. Gladstone has been engaged with regard to the Liberal party. A series of strikes was to be organized in order to prove the vitality of the Unions and the authority of the leaders. The strike at Oldham was frustrated by the prompt and resolute "lock-out" of the employers, accompanied as it was by the offer of conciliatory terms to those who chose to abandon the larger demand dictated from Manchester. The engineers of Sunderland found a more opportune occasion of attack. The masters were for the moment financially weak, and ill-prepared for resistance. They succumbed before assistance could reach them, and the nine hours' movement thus attained a footing from which it was thought that it could be advantageously directed against Newcastle. The strikers have been deceived, however, in their expectations of an easy victory. The heads of the great engineering factories offered a strenuous resistance, and other capitalists and employers of labour have now come to their aid. The men on strike have from the outset been supported by subscriptions from several Unions, as well as by eloquent exhortations from Mr. Odger and other practised agitators. It appears to them, however, to be monstrous and intolerable that the employers should now combine to resist a concerted attack which, if successful, would be only the beginning of a campaign. In the first instance the Newcastle employers were, we think, wrong in refusing to treat personally with the League, which had undoubted authority to speak for the operatives; but they have subsequently offered a reduction of two hours a week, and, when this was refused, they were willing to refer the questions at issue to a vote by ballot among the men. It is highly significant that the leaders of the strike instantly declined to submit to the test of the ballot.

This strike illustrates very distinctly the two great fallacies which run through the whole of the Unionist philosophy. The first is, that the amount of work to be had in any trade is a fixed quantity, and that, in order that all may get a share, it must, in homely phrase, be spread thin to make it go far. The second is, that the masters can always get their own price from the public. The first of these is of course an utter delusion, the chances being that the more a man works, and the better and cheaper he works, the more he will get to do if he chooses to take it. The terms on which he offers his skill and labour encourage the demand for it. As to the other fallacy, the whole tenancy of the age is to increase the amount of competition to which each trade is exposed, both at home and abroad, and consequently to narrow the discretionary authority of employers in fixing the prices of their goods. It is true, however, that in most trades, over and above the ordinary rate of interest on capital invested in such speculations, there is a margin of profit for which the men may fairly "boggle" with the masters, if they think they are in a position to command a larger share of it. Of course the engineers of Newcastle are quite entitled to fix their own price for their labour, and refuse to take less. There is no question of moral culpability on their part, as long as they content themselves with holding out for higher wages, and do not interfere with other workmen who have more modest or reasonable views; they have only their own interest to consult, and the question is, whether they are acting wisely for themselves. In the present instance, even if the men carry their point, it is doubtful whether the engineering business of Newcastle will not be crippled for a long time to come by the loss of capital which has already occurred, as well as by the drift of trade elsewhere. It seems to us that when a quarrel of this kind occurs, there is only one rational and practical means of determining which side is in the right. A factory is composed of a managing capitalist and a body of workmen, and in one sense the latter may be said to employ the manager as much as he employs them. There is a compact between them, by which they are to receive fixed wages, while he is to get the profits after all expenses are paid. If he is dissatisfied with his men, he puts others in their place; and in the same way, if they are dissatisfied with him, either on account of his mode of management or allowance of pay, they should try to get somebody else to manage that part of the work for them. If they can do that on terms more agreeable or profitable to themselves, then they are in the right; if not, it is sheer suicide, folly to leave off work altogether. We are glad to see that some of the Newcastle engineers are getting up a co-operative factory. We have no right to assume that it is a hopeless and impracticable scheme. We hope it will succeed, though experience of such enterprises renders us the reverse of sanguine on the subject. But in any case the experiment will do good, because it will bring to a practical test the question whether the engineers can get better terms from a manager appointed by themselves than from one who hires them at a fixed wage and takes all risks. Whether the manager is paid by salary or profits is a mere matter of detail. The usual blunder of the working-men lies in thinking that the manager is a costly ornament, and that they could do very well without one, or with a cheap clerk in his place. It is quite certain that the varied

and important qualifications required in such a functionary have their price, and it is a high price which must be paid in one shape or another. In the present instance there can be no doubt that the strike is part of a general movement organized by the Unions, and that the object is to compel the masters to employ a larger number of men, while continuing to pay the same wages as before. This was, in fact, admitted by a recent resolution of the Manchester Trades Committee, to the effect that the general extension of machinery in manufactures has gradually led to the existence of a large surplus of labour, and that it is expedient to promote the absorption of the excess, "either by the reduction of the hours of labour, or by the adoption of legislative measures to restrict all labour to ten hours per day." However false the political economy of the Unionists may be, they have a perfect right to go their own way as long as they do not interfere with the liberty of other workmen. It concerns not merely the peace of Newcastle, but the dignity of the law and the reality of freedom in this country, that the attempt of the men on strike at Newcastle to coerce the imported workmen into joining their revolt should be promptly and severely repressed.

THE SAXONS AMONG THE CELTS.

IT seems to be of little purpose that illustrated journals and others are taking Ireland under their especial patronage. We hear of few pilgrims to the island of St. Patrick, but it will be a great season for Scotland. In vain do Special Correspondents dilate magniloquently on Connemara, trick out the beauties of the Groves of Blarney with the glowing tints of their lively fancies, and rise superbly to the sublimity of the basalt coasts of iron-bound Antrim. In flagrant injustice to ill-used Ireland the rush sets northward, and Scotch innkeepers are at their wits' end to furnish what Parisian *écorceurs* euphemistically term hospitality for the shoals of strangers who crowd their gates. This year that "hospitality" will be even more dearly paid than usual, and in one sense an exceedingly gratifying sign of the times it is. Who dare whisper of the decay of enthusiastic loyalty when we witness the flow of respectful devotion that sets towards Monarchy? It is not that a flourish of the wand of some new Wizard of the North has advertised the place with a second Legend of Montrose. It is a lady born in the purple, to be sacrificed as a second Iphigenia in the wane of her honeymoon for the benefit of the clan of her adoption. With all our profound conviction of the courtly sentiments of the classes from whom our Highland tourists are recruited, we had no conception how immensely the spectacle would draw. We have seen something of the excitement in such towns as Perth and Aberdeen when Her Majesty's train had arranged to bait there *en route* for Balmoral. We have marvelled at the spectacle of overdressed mobs hustling each other through a long morning on the chance of sighting the distant flutter of a Royal bonnet-ribbon through a carriage glass. Yet our imagination refused to rise to the realization of the amount of self-imposed suffering and humiliation that must be undergone during the coming festivities. It is bad enough to have to endure a crush in London in the height of the season, or in any great city during one of those Universal Expositions which are beginning to go out of fashion. But there is, after all, a certain fitness in crowds in cities; nor are you driven to the same sad shifts, because you can always count on some kind of accommodation. But a crowd in a Highland hamlet—we beg the pardon of the burghers, but Inverary is a hamlet relatively speaking—the apotheosis of snobbishness in the bosom of nature, is a different thing altogether.

That MacCallum More very sensibly gives a new fashion of Highland welcome to his uninvited visitors by retaining the principal inn and all the best apartments for the guests he has bidden, in no degree materially aggravates the discomfort of the invading hordes. As far as we can learn, when each nook and cranny has been filled to overflowing, myriads must be turned away in any case. Experience has taught us what are the comforts of an over-filled Highland inn at the best of times. You have a landlord utterly demoralized by excess of prosperity, accepting payment of swinging bills from suppliants who humble themselves before him, and turning a deaf ear to remonstrants, as absolute master of the situation. You have waiters who pant helplessly in hopeless arrear of work far beyond their utmost powers; who have been taught by repeated disappointment to distrust tourist nature in the matter of extra tips; and who, in vindictive misanthropy, pelt you with dishes and tarnished forks over dirty table-cloths laid all awry. You have a cook enshrined in remote mystery, whose scorched productions bear the melancholy impress of bustling work and fiery temper; chambermaids who ignore the broken bells, and boots who burrow away out of hail in the back regions, till the moment arrives for levying black mail on the departing guest. In these circumstances, however, there is always a drop of comfort at the bottom of your bitter cup. Hope still tells the flattering tale that has proved so often delusive, and excitement and perpetual motion somehow pull you through. You will change your quarters to-morrow, unless you are storm-bound, which is certainly very probable; you may change for the better, and you cannot possibly change for the worse. But these Inverary visitors deliberately burn the galleys that bore them up Loch Fyne, and pledge themselves, by previously paying a fancy rent, to a sojourn of ten long dreary days of fêtes tempered by broken slumbers and semi-starvation. We can imagine the sore struggle in the minds of the inhabitants of

the ducal burgh between love of comfort and lust of gain. It is not in Highland nature to refuse to profit by the windfall that will enrich its neighbours, and yet, when your cottage is a tight fit for your numerous family, it is hard to know where to billet your guests. You save your conscience by telling it that they have only their own folly to blame if they are abominably uncomfortable, and that anything is good enough "for the like of them." You furbish up accordingly the old haircloth sofa in the parlour, the sofa that has felt hard of late years even to your own seasoned frame, and you prepare the box-bed in the dusty closet that has done duty from time immemorial for a lumber-room. We could only wish *Punch's* special artist might assist at the interview when the elaborately unconscious Celt ushers his horrified lodger to his bedroom. That fancy picture, however, presupposes a mansion of the first or second order; but Inverary men of all degrees in the social scale will insist on having a pluck at the heaven-sent flock of wild geese. Has Mr. Brown, who rather congratulates himself on having decided to rough it, when he sees the setting sun gild the humble cottage that offers him a shelter, ever smarted under the irritating qualities of all-pervading peat reek, or practised sleeping among famished swarms of venomous insect life? Loch Fyne herrings are unrivalled, and porridge and oat-cakes are admirably wholesome fare for those to the fashion born. But one and the other are likely to pall on Southern appetites freshened by Highland breezes. Inverary will offer a Barmecide feast, where the enthusiastic satellites of the Court, revolving unhappily in external orbits, will fast and hunger within sight and smell of the Castle revelry. We only trust the whisky they turn to for consolation may not mount to their heads; but it would seem as if the experienced authorities have felt seriously uneasy on that score, and determined to take every precaution against contingencies. At least we read that not only is there to be a strong force of police on the spot—a measure obviously needful to preserve the peace between the natives and the disgusted guests—but that a formidable local force has been improvised, draped in the clan tartan, and armed with the Lochaber axe. It carries us back to the times when Dugald Dalgetty passed the block and the bloody axe as he entered the Castle gates. Is His Grace of Argyll still Lord High Justiciary of Scotland, and has he a statutory right to administer red-handed justice in his wild domains? We hope the best, but, from seeing all the causes likely to generate bad blood, we have a right to augur the very worst. We heard more than enough about it when the Irish constabulary used their *bâtons*, on the responsibility of the Irish Secretary, to scatter a seditious gathering. Even Mr. Gladstone's case-hardened Government can scarcely afford to have the Secretary for India slip his armed clansmen on the confiding strangers who have flocked to gaze and gaze. There is enough of the farcical in the tourist gathering at Inverary, to all except those personally concerned; we should be grieved indeed to hear of its culminating in sanguinary tragedy.

So far as anxiety and roughing it go, the Highland tourist is better broken in than most pleasure-seekers, although he may never have exposed his fortitude to a trial so formidable as this. Things have improved steadily in those parts since Buillie Nicol Jarvie ventured with Mr. Osbaldistone across the Highland line, or Dr. Samuel Johnson started from Fleet Street on his daring expedition to the Hebrides. But still the Highland traveller neither rolls invariably upon patent springs nor sleeps as a rule on beds of roses. The country truly is magnificent, and fashion and habit have educated people to pretend to appreciate its beauties; but the climate is incorrigible—as capriciously lachrymose and gusty as ever. You may travel for days in the height of summer and see nothing beyond the whalebone ribs of your umbrella, save streaming rain and driving fog. Except for occasional fantastic cloud effects, and the eccentric angles at which you find yourself and your vehicle incline, you might just as well be jogging along among Dutch polders and canals. Your best excitement is in speculation as to whether you are likely to find a resting-place, food, fire, and shelter. There are excellent and spacious hotels in the Highlands, but as a rule the country is decidedly under-inn, and the wildest neighbourhoods are of course the worst provided. The season for haymaking is a short one at best, and it is a heavy strain on a canny Scotchman's faith to provide accommodation that must stand empty nine months in the year. Now and then the deficiency is no fault of his. Certain great proprietors set their faces as much as possible against intrusion on their privacy, and give license to no more than a single hostelry in the village by their lodge. Usually they bestow the living on a veteran retainer who airs his noble patron's dignity at secondhand. His house contains some four private sitting-rooms to be scrambled for, and it is ten to one that a couple of these have been retained for the whole shooting season by sportsmen who have rented the neighbouring moor. An amateur artist comes summer after summer to the third, and the fourth and last is of course pretty sure to be engaged long before the arrival of your telegram. When you arrive with your party, late and tired and hungry, as a matter of favour you are packed away in a couple of attics for bedrooms, while you must descend to the public coffee-room with your ladies to forage for victuals. One glimpse of that small and cheerless apartment, with its single square table and straight-backed, hard-cushioned chairs, rudely dissipates your hopes of a snug dinner served decently and in order. The waiter, who regards your arrival as a personal injury, suggests a second edition of the tea which the overgrown family from Glasgow are absorbing with audible suction at one end, and your choice seems to lie between that and the Finns and steaming toddy

which a group of jovial spirits are indulging in at the other. Even with your lines fallen in circumstances like these, you may regard yourselves as relatively fortunate. If it is a Saturday night, the chances are that you find the place crammed from cellar to ceiling, and it is a serious thing to have to fare further in the dark, when fifteen mountain miles separate you from your next chance of shelter. Then your prospects of finding private conveyances are worse than precarious, while public ones are often of the roughest, and the company in many cases more than promiscuous. It must mar the enjoyment of the least fastidious of mortals to make the middle passage between Loch Lomond and Loch Katrine in an enormous open break overlaid with publicans and sinners something less than refined in their sympathies, and very far from choice in their language. Their one idea of a holiday is perpetual refreshment, and they travel the land of poetry and romance in a state of chronic exaltation. Or, by way of contrast to a hackneyed route, take a remote one in the North-west. There "the machine" that carries the winter mails does duty for the summer traffic. You must admire the scenery with game-boxes, tar-barrels, coils of wire-fencing slipping down on your shrinking shoulders, burly shepherds good-humouredly sitting into your aching ribs, and quarrelsome dogs of every breed wedged into the interstices about your legs. You have to tempt stormy arms of the sea in open boats, through falling rain and driving spray, and in constant apprehension of the fate of Lord Ullin's daughter and her lover. If the elements are against you, from the beginning of your tour to the end your clothes are as damp as a forecastle man's in a China clipper. We do not say you have not your intervals of pleasure, your stray moments of rapture; very far from it. We merely aver that the Highland tourist's lot is more than a chequered one; and as it is the fashion to look on its sunny side, we have taken the occasion of the gathering at Inverary to call attention to the cloudy one.

OUR MILITARY POSITION IN INDIA.

IN seeking to solve the question of military organization for the whole Empire we meet, when considering what should be the composition, the organization, and the distribution of our Indian army, with difficulties of no inconsiderable magnitude. These difficulties are increased by the decision now arrived at, that our soldiers shall in future be, as a rule, enlisted for short service, of which, save in exceptional cases, six years is to be the minimum. In the course of thirty-five years Indian service has been gradually reduced from twenty to twelve years, and according to present arrangements will shortly be reduced to ten years. But even ten years will be too long unless arrangements are made for special enlistments for India. India, however, absorbs nearly a third of the British army, and to sanction long service for one-third of the army while with two-thirds short service is adopted would destroy that uniformity of system which is so desirable, and would be productive of other inconveniences which are so obvious that it is unnecessary here to point them out.

It has been suggested by those who see no other way out of the difficulty that we should establish a local European army for service in India, but there are many arguments to be adduced against this proposal. By the establishment of a local army we should deprive our troops of a training-ground which, within certain limits, is of the greatest value. Deprived of opportunities of Indian service the rest of the army would, as has been justly observed, become in time little more than a militia. Again, we should deprive both India and the rest of the Empire of the power of reciprocal aid. Between the local force and the rest of the army there would be a great legal gulf fixed which could not be bridged over without considerable delay or expense. Further, the local army, having no opportunity of ascertaining and correcting shortcomings by occasional service in England, and having no general service regiments by its side as standards, would be apt to deteriorate both in efficiency and discipline. The old Company's regiments possessed such a standard, and yet in 1859 and 1860 these regiments were in a most lamentable condition. A local army would be a remedy worse than the evil it is sought to cure, and the idea of its establishment cannot therefore be entertained. What plan will be adopted is not yet known; probably the Government have not made up their minds on the subject; but it is certain that for numerous reasons connected both with finance and organization it is at the present moment especially incumbent on us to diminish those difficulties which we cannot altogether sweep away, by making our British troops in India go as far as they can. Some people consider that our force in that country might with advantage be diminished: the majority, headed by no less an authority than Lord Sandhurst, are of opinion that our troops have been reduced as much as is compatible with prudence, and even that they are at the present moment dangerously few. Whether we accept the one opinion or the other, no doubt can exist in any thoughtful mind that we have not made such a use of military science as to get the most available profit from the force we maintain; that another mutiny might occur any day, and that we should have almost as hard a task as we had in 1857-58 to put it down. The elements for an explosion exist in plenty, and only require a spark to break out into wide-spreading destruction. A single Russian battalion may not for a century to come cross the Hindoo Khoosh, but Russian intrigue and Russian money are as dangerous as Russian arms, especially now that the anti-English party has gained the

upper hand in Afghanistan. Direct war is not to be dreaded, but vicarious hostility, profiting perhaps by discontent at an unpopular measure or making use of a Mahommedan revival, may work serious mischief. It behoves us, therefore, apart from the general reorganization of our military system, to set our house in India in order, and to make the most of our limited number of men by means of a correct application of the maxims of military science. Whatever may be said by theorists, those who are acquainted with the East know that it is necessary to occupy India as a conquered country, whereas our troops are scattered broadcast over the land, as if the population were British and contented. There is no systematic strategic distribution of the army, which is stationed here and there in a fragmentary manner, partly by chance, partly on account of the existence in certain places of expensive barracks, and partly for reasons which were valid once, but no longer hold good. Our Indian Empire and our Indian army have grown up gradually and together. Bit by bit a patch of territory was added to our dominions, and as each bit was conquered or annexed, an addition was made to our troops, and the new territory was occupied in a fashion justified by temporary and local considerations, but having no connexion with the security of the Empire as a whole. What restrains the natives is rather the unknown resources which they hear of or imagine than those which they see. It is more in the potential strength of an army of reserve than in the actually witnessed and computed small garrisons scattered all over the country, and in many cases several days' march from succour, that our strength consists. Again, one British regiment would be paralysed by an insurrection of 10,000 natives, while ten British regiments acting in a body would be more than a match for 100,000 rebels. The mutineers failed in 1857 chiefly because the outbreak was not simultaneous; had the contrary been the case, it is probable that the British troops would have been crushed in detail, and never have been able to concentrate. We cannot reckon on such a favourable circumstance in future, and we should therefore take our measures in time, so arranging the distribution of the army that on an outbreak concentration would be rapid and easy. We should keep our army permanently prepared to take the field in large bodies and in the highest state of efficiency. At the same time a certain amount of local occupation is absolutely necessary not only for military, but also for political and police reasons.

The main principle which in our opinion should regulate our military policy in India is as follows:—With a view to maintain in security lines of communication with our principal military bases, Calcutta and Kurrachee, certain strategical centres, such as Allahabad, Agra, Mooltan, and Lahore should be strongly fortified with earthworks, and occupied by substantial garrisons strong enough to send out strong flying columns into the district. Other minor strategical points, such as Benares, Jubbulpore, Cawnpore, Lucknow, Umballa, Loodianah, Delhi, Jhelum, and certain places in Southern India should also be fortified, but occupied with smaller and little more than defensive garrisons. Towns of less importance should be denuded of all British troops; and indeed the number of what are termed civil stations should be reduced as much as possible; but in all such places the Treasury and Government offices should be situated in forts well provided with bomb-proof cover and protected from an enemy's fire. These forts might be composed chiefly of stout stockade work, partly of earthen works so disposed as to enclose the largest possible space while defensible by a very small garrison. In the forts should be placed the arms, a small magazine, and provisions sufficient to sustain the garrison for six months. By the judicious employment of a few small surface mines these forts might easily and cheaply be rendered quite strong enough to maintain an independent defence till the arrival of succour. In these places of refuge all the Government servants, the European shopkeepers, and loyal half-castes, and natives with their families might receive protection, and the males of the party would constitute the garrison. All railway stations should also be constructed with a view to defence, the garrison being the railway servants, recently organized as Volunteers, and they would serve as so many guard-houses for the protection of the line and the telegraphs. A cuirassed train carrying a gun and a score of riflemen might also with advantage be introduced on every railway line in India. Of course Peshawur would have to be occupied by a British garrison, and so would also Calcutta, Bombay, Madras, Kurrachee, and Rangoon. The garrison batteries, and most of the field batteries and the cavalry, would necessarily be kept in the plains, and the two latter would be available for moveable columns to be sent out in case of need from the principal strategical centres. A few, however, of the field batteries and regiments of cavalry might be stationed on some of the high table-lands which are to be found here and there in India, and on the lower ranges of the Himalayas. All infantry regiments not employed as garrisons should be stationed in the hills, the number of hill stations being considerably increased. It has long since been decided that European infantry should be stationed as far as possible in the hills, but as yet little progress has been made towards carrying out the idea. The main reason for this delay has been the expense of forming hill stations, of constructing roads to them, and of bringing up supplies. A principal cause of this expense has been that the stations in question have been established on sites higher than is necessary, and in consequence at a totally unnecessary distance from the plains. Another reason has been the almost exclusive employment of native workmen. A remedy might easily be applied. At pre-

sent, not content with getting beyond the fever level, we often mount to the region of diarrhoea and rheumatism, and take our regiments to such a height that the violent contrast with the climate of the plains produces no small amount of liver disease. Excellent sites at moderate elevations, and consequently at reasonable distances from the plain—say from six to ten miles—might be easily found, and not only would the sanitary results be good, but the cost of construction of roads and the expense of transport would be enormously lessened.

The fact is that the Indian Government has never caused the hill territory to be systematically explored with a view to the location of troops. Generally speaking, the sites have been stumbled on accidentally either by some energetic magistrate or by a Commander-in-Chief in the course of a rapid ride from one point to another. The cost of forming hill stations might also be lessened by a freer use of the labour of British troops. Very little extra remuneration in addition to the pleasure of escaping from the routine and heat of the plains would procure an unlimited number of volunteers. The pay given to a native workman would quite satisfy the British soldier, and the work accomplished by the former is at least double that performed by the latter. Lords Sandhurst and Napier have within the last few years employed military labour in the hills with excellent effect, as is shown by the result of the working parties near Murree, and the 55th Regiment, under their able and energetic Colonel Hume, at the new station of Chukrata; but more might be done with infinite advantage both to the army and the State. Even if a large sum of money were required to carry out the scheme, it would be well invested, and a loan might very properly be raised for such a purpose. Viewing the question from a purely economical point of view, and setting aside considerations of humanity, the undertaking would pay. To replace a soldier dead or invalided is an expensive process, and the effect of great mortality on enlistment is very serious—witness the case of the 78th Highlanders, when under Sir Charles Napier in Scinde. Besides, 30,000 men starting from the hills in a state of rude health to enter on a campaign are equal to 50,000 men enfeebled by a continued residence in the plains. The effect also on the imagination of the natives of keeping our army for the most part in the hills would be very great. All the conquerors of India have crossed mountains, and the idea that on the slightest appearance of rebellion an indefinite number of troops would pour down like so many torrents from the hills, to unite in one overwhelming wave, would be equal to the actual presence of an additional 50,000 men. Concentration could be accomplished with much greater facility at the foot of the hills than in the centre of plains swarming with rebels.

We have already spoken of the proposition of organizing a local European army in India, and pointed out the strong objections to such a scheme. A sort of compromise, however, would be not only possible, but advisable. After a soldier has been some time in India, he is apt to look on military service in England as distasteful, and even to dislike the idea of returning home as a civilian. There is plenty of scope for British energy and labour in the hills, particularly at the large sanatoria, and on the lower ranges. In the former a small capitalist could do well as a builder, decorator, gardener, and shopkeeper, and indeed many old soldiers are thus employed. In the latter farming and tea cultivation can be carried on with great profit. The discharged soldier might employ himself either as principal or overseer, and if there were no suitable ground actually surrounding his house it would be easy to find a site for his residence within an hour's walk or half-hour's ride from the foot of the hills which would be the scene of his labours. It does not pay an Englishman to engage in manual labour; but if intelligent and trustworthy, he is worth his weight in gold to an employer as superintendent, or he may earn for himself a comfortable subsistence, if possessed of a small capital. Why should not an old soldier of good conduct, and owner of say 80*l.* in the Savings Bank—and that sum can be easily saved by a careful man in the course of ten years, even if only a private—be discharged on application from the regular army and re-engaged as a military settler? The Government might allot him a certain number of acres, small if situated near an existing station, larger if in an unsettled district; might advance him a certain sum to cover the expense of building a house and settling, and, so long as he should continue efficient, give him a retiring allowance monthly, wives and children receiving, say, half the family allowance granted to British soldiers, for a certain period, say five years. After a certain specified time, the land might become the settler's absolute property, contingent on his rendering military service personally or by a relation, or paying a certain annual fine in case of the impossibility of providing a substitute from his own family. We are much mistaken if in the course of a few years we should not possess some half-dozen battalions of military settlers, each from 500 to 600 men strong. To enter into all the details of such a project would be to exceed our province, but we may remark that the idea is not new, for both General Sir Vincent Eyre and Major Knollys simultaneously conceived the idea, and promulgated a scheme some years ago setting forth their notions both in print and before the Royal United Service Institution. The battalions might be settled not only in the Himalayas and Neigherries, but also on the numerous isolated elevations to be found all over India. Each village might contain a company or half company, under a captain or lieutenant; every sub-district might contain a half battalion under a major; every district a battalion under a lieutenant-

colonel. These officers should be retired officers of the regular army, should receive grants of lands and a small advance in the first instance, and should execute the functions of collectors and magistrates. The surgeons also would perform the duties of civil surgeons, especially with regard to vaccination; the paymaster would act as civil treasurer; and the quartermaster as commissariat officer. The other officers might, in addition to military and magisterial duties, be also employed as surveyors and engineers.

Another great improvement might be introduced into our Indian system which would result in considerable saving of expense to the State and of discomfort to individuals. At present, in pursuance of old traditions and for reasons no longer applicable, regiments are perpetually changing quarters, and no corps on first coming to a station knows whether it will remain there three months or three years. No regiment should be moved from a station under two years.

In organization also there is much room for improvement. Lord Sandhurst pointed out the inconvenience and anomalies of the present system. The Commander-in-Chief in Bengal is also Commander-in-Chief in India, and a member of the Supreme Council. He is supposed to advise the Governor-General on all military matters; but, in addition, there is a military secretary to Government and a military member of Council. It is impossible that such a system can work well, and, as a matter of fact, it does not. The Governor-General has three advisers, each responsible for the conduct of military affairs, and each perhaps entertaining different views on the same subject. The Commander-in-Chief is moreover oppressed with much routine work and many financial and semi-civil affairs. In time of peace he must neglect either his purely military, or his semi-military and altogether civil work, but when war breaks out the latter must be completely thrown overboard. Lord Sandhurst proposes as a remedy that a military officer of rank should be appointed as a sort of Minister of War, always remaining with the Governor-General, and that all India should be divided into so many *corps d'armée* districts, each under a lieutenant-general, exercising the same powers as the present Commander-in-Chief of Bombay and Madras. These districts might be the following:—Bombay, Madras, Central India, Bengal and the Eastern Frontier, Oudh and the North-West Provinces, and the Punjab, being six in all. To prevent the Minister of War from yielding to the temptation of commanding in the field, a stringent prohibitory regulation on the subject might be drawn up. We have no hesitation in asserting that the existing system is inconvenient, cumbrous, an anachronism, and productive of great delay in moments of danger. The great necessity in India is prompt and vigorous action, and by the proposed system prompt and vigorous action would be secured.

In conclusion we would state our strong conviction that we ought in India to show and employ our troops almost invariably in masses; that to impress the natives we should in time of peace establish, in every cold season, at different spots in the plains, camps of from 10,000 to 20,000 men, the troops being brought down from the hills for the purpose; and that both in peace and in war we should adopt as our principle concentration, in opposition to the dispersion which now prevails.

ARCHBISHOP LAUD.

PERHAPS no man has ever had his character and his purposes estimated at such wonderfully contradictory values as Archbishop Laud. He still continues to be reckoned, after two centuries of criticism, as the finest gold of humanity by Anglicanism, and as the vilest human refuse by Puritanism. The one knows no more noble hero, the other knows no more contemptible scoundrel. The biographer has not yet written who has had the judgment to strike a true balance between the adoring enthusiasm of Heylin and Lawson and the foulmouthed abuse of two centuries of Puritan historians. That *genius cloacæ* which could inspire such epithets as Vicers and Burton invented and poured out so profusely upon Laud has ceased indeed to inspire English writers, unless it be this same genius, at length grown sweet, which is responsible for the epithets of gush and benediction which the prophets of the *Daily Telegraph* bestow upon the latest popular idol. This at least is not improbable in an age which can make butter out of Thames deposit. A little drift, however, of the ill-mannered eloquence of their fathers does seem to have come down to the sons, since in the preface to the second volume of a History of the Church of England, published for the use of Nonconformists in the *Library for the Times*, we read of "the execrable Laud."

Laud has hitherto been sketched from three different points of view. Heylin and his followers have painted the Anglican Churchman who died for the faith; their Laud is the glorified saint and martyr. "His death is the more remarkable," says Heylin (who no doubt longed to have his hero called St. William) "in falling on St. William's day." The collector of coincidences may add that this St. William (who is not in the Anglican Calendar) was also an Archbishop, and was an enemy of Puritanism, for just before his death in 1205 he was preparing himself for a mission among the Albigenses, the Puritans of the thirteenth century. Neal, Calamy, Crosby, and Ivinney, and all the historians of the three Puritan sects who have followed these wearisome and uncritical leaders, have painted a consecrated butcher, the great English Antichrist, the enemy of all righteousness. Modern

Liberals have introduced an entirely new portrait of Laud as the great impracticable Tory of Tories. We have at the present day thousands of persons heartily believing that they know Archbishop Laud thoroughly, some of whom believe that he was Heylin's Laud, some that he was the Puritan's Laud, some that he was Lord Macaulay's and Mr. Forster's Laud. Justice can only be done to Laud by looking at him, not as the excited political and religious partisans of his own time regarded him, or as the inheritors of their prejudices in our time still regard him, but as he was esteemed by some of the most noble and liberal of his European contemporaries. Justice was even then done to the Archbishop out of England, which was never done to him in England, and which indeed could not possibly have been done on account of two monstrous alliances then existing here. A liberal theology was united to an illiberal policy on Laud's side, and a narrow and illiberal theology had made a covenant with a liberal and generous policy on the side of the Puritans. A clearer conception of Laud's true position and aims, and of his insuperable difficulties in carrying out his aims, may be derived from the letters of his great friend and admirer, Grotius, whom many regard as a father of Rationalism, and who was certainly the most liberal, as he was among the most learned, of the European theologians of his time. We learn more about Laud from Grotius than even from the Archbishop's own diary, if that diary be read alone. The concurrent correspondence of Grotius throws light upon the diary; and we must also recollect that the diary was originally published in a mutilated form, for the express end of damaging the Archbishop's reputation, that it had its first circulation and first effects in this mutilated form, and that all its earliest readers supposed that Prynne's excerpts were the exhibition of Laud's whole mind, the whole and the only record of life which he thought worth his keeping. Such a mutilation most people in this day would call dishonest trickery. "Prynne, though no humourist," says Mr. Rogers in his *Historical Gleanings*, "had the wit to select those entries which were most damaging to Laud's reputation." Great mirth has been made out of Laud's reports of his dreams; but what an indignant howl of unfairness would have been raised if any partisan who took a view of Baxter contradictory to Calamy's view had, instead of Calamy, abridged Baxter's autobiography, and had pretended to paint Baxter to the life by recording his solemn application of the moss off a dead man's skull to cure his "depauperation," and his endless and querulous catalogue of every petty pain he felt and every medicine he took for it.

If, however, Laud be fairly contrasted with his opponents, nothing is more remarkable about him than his comparative freedom from superstition. Superstition, we must recollect, meant in the Puritan vocabulary Popery, Prelacy, mince-pies at Christmas, the use of "conceived prayers," and the like; it did not mean the observance of omens and presages, or the belief in "judgments." To find the superstition of the seventeenth century, in the modern sense of the word, we must turn from the Anglican to the Puritan writers. The stringing together of *catena* of "judgments" gave employment to a great number of Puritan bookmakers. A "judgment" meant the direct interference of God to punish men for opposing some Puritan theory. Their books of judgments on Sabbath-breakers still command, we believe, some amount of acceptance from a few of their most obscure descendants. The *Practical Sabbatarian* of Edward Wells (a quarto of above seven hundred pages) contains more credulous superstition than all the Anglican and Roman works published for the English readers of that period; and yet this is a work of some show of learning, and by no means the most uncritical of its large class. At the restoration of the Church there was, it seems, a demand amongst the Puritans for *catena* of summary "judgments" upon men who first put on the surplice, who first read the Common Prayer Book, first administered the Sacrament to kneeling communicants, or first showed other signs of conformity; and the demand was richly and amusingly supplied. By comparing the writings of the New England Quakers and of the New England Independents, we may gather some quaint results—the same event being treated by George Fox as the judgment of God against the Independent persecutors, and by the Independent preachers as His judgment against Quakerism. One of the leaders of the Independents was seized and scalped by the Indians. "The judgments of God came upon them for persecuting the Quakers; but the blind, dark priests" (that is, of Independency), writes George Fox, "said it was because they did not persecute them enough." The recently published *Diary of Nehemiah Wallington* is crowded with evidences of Puritan superstition, and most of them are naively related as unanswerable testimonies of God against the superstition of Laud and his clergy. One young man is killed for ringing church bells on the Lord's Day; churches are destroyed by thunder and lightning because altars or ceremonies have been set up in them. Men and women who kneel at the Communion are forcibly seized by an invisible power, lifted up from their knees, and set upon the form; or they are affected by strange pains in the lower parts of their bodies, while those parts of the body which are free from the guilt of idolatry are free also from pain. In one case there is a great fire and noise, and "loathsome smell of gunpowder and brimstone," "at the north side of the Communion-table." If the Anglicans had really been as superstitious as their opponents, they might have laid hold of this as an evidence of the hatred of the devil to the ritual reforms of Archbishop Laud. The science by which this kind of superstition was in time to be destroyed was, it must

be remembered, represented almost entirely by men ejected by the Puritans from their cures or from the University. Some of these men had Laud for their patron, others for their protector against Puritan intolerance; others, like Bishops Wilkins, Seth Ward, and Stillingfleet, Isaac Barrow, the founders of the Royal Society, and the scholars nicknamed "moral men," who were so hardly used at the Universities during the Puritan rule, preserved the greatest respect for Laud's memory. Liberal thought, as such, was not repressed or persecuted by the Archbishop; its two most advanced representatives, according to popular judgment, Hales and Chillingworth, were his personal friends, and he bestowed preferment on each of them. Both were ejected by the Puritans; and the atrocious treatment of Chillingworth in his last days, and of his body in its grave, is unexampled in the history of Pharisaic malice. Chillingworth was brought back from Ultramontaniam by Laud, and Hales (if we may trust Heylin) from Socinianism. Yet Laud was accused of being both a Romanist and a Socinian. The last charge, made seriously in his own day, has now slipped out of men's memories; but the honest biographer will have to ask himself what was meant by it.

Archbishop Laud was hateful to the Puritans for three reasons, and each reason is one which ought to commend him to a more patient and more thorough examination by modern Liberals than they have yet troubled themselves to give him. First, he was the chief promoter of a theology which the Puritans were damning as too liberal, too generous, and too full of hope for the whole human race. The rich and noble Puritans had made up their minds that the great majority of their fellow-countrymen were to be worse off than themselves in the other world as well as in this. The "people of God" were not the whole mass of the christened English people, but a small handful of elect saints—preachers, wealthy merchants, and gentlemen—scattered thinly amongst the eternally reprobated English people. Laud believed that man, as man, was dear to God and chosen by God; the Puritans believed that God only loved man as Puritan. It was Laud's mistake that, in the interest of social freedom and ecclesiastical unity, he ruthlessly prohibited the preachers of universal damnation and peculiar salvation from the free publication of their comfortable and Pharisaic doctrine. The real judgment of the English people against Laud's enemies has been given by the meaning fixed upon the adjective "puritanical," but Laud had not the patience to wait for this judgment. Mr. Rogers in one passage of his lecture on William Laud indicates the real motor of the Archbishop's vigorous activity. "The Universities," he says, "were the stronghold of Puritanism, and they especially favoured the creed of Augustin as interpreted by Calvin. He was a bold man who dared, during Elizabeth's reign, to utter from the pulpit of either Church of St. Mary any doubts as to predestination and election." "We must not allow ourselves to be juggled by the sound of old phrases, and forget what these phrases mean when translated into modern English. "He was a bold man who dared" to deny the reprobation to everlasting damnation of the great majority of English men, women, and children, and who dared to maintain that every English man, woman, and child was an object of the charity of God. Laud dared this, and dared it when he was at Oxford and before any prospect of a consequent advancement in this world was likely to repay him for the daring.

The continuation of the paragraph of which we have cited the commencement leads us to the second reason of the hatred of the Puritans to Archbishop Laud. "It was only a slender party," Mr. Rogers goes on to say, "which was beginning to look with contempt on foreign reformed Churches, and was insisting on the necessity of episcopal government and episcopal ordination as a fundamental condition of Christianity. But among the earliest of these separatists was William Laud." There is a naive humour in giving Laud the very name which his enemies claimed as their peculiar glory. It is true that Laud while at Oxford boldly declared his conviction that Chrysostom and the early Greek Fathers were better theologians than Calvin and Rivet, and a host of Calvinist theologians then famous in Oxford, but now utterly forgotten. It is true that he thought the Reformation would neither stand firm nor make way on the Continent until the Continental Churches had Episcopacy, and some other things which he thought they lacked. But the Archbishop never looked upon the foreign Protestants with contempt. He was hated by the Puritans as the chief promoter of unity amongst all who called themselves Christians; but it was not so much his imputed aim and effort to unite Papists and Protestants, as his real aim and unceasing efforts to unite Arminians and Calvinists, that brought upon him the bitterest anger of his English and Scottish foes. The "pacifator," John Dury (better known in Germany than in England at the present day), was a Presbyterian, a Scot, and—when Laud sent him abroad on his work of reunion—a Calvinist; but these differences were no bar to the Archbishop's employment of him; he believed that he recognised in Dury the peace-making and peace-loving mind; and for ten years during which Dury was on his mission in Poland, Prussia, Denmark, Switzerland, Transylvania, and wherever Lutherans or Calvinists were to be found, Laud was following him with the most eager interest. Strong as were Laud's convictions about the necessity of Episcopacy to the well-being and to the unity of the Church, in all his correspondence with the great Protestant scholars of the age (with Grotius, Vossius, Junius, and such men), or with the Lutheran and Reformed Churches, there is not one syllable to imply that he held them to

lack anything which can be called "a fundamental condition of Christianity." On the contrary, he always speaks to them as already united with him in a common opposition to Popery. He urges them to answer Baronius. He sends to them, for their criticism, his own answer to Fisher. He could not indeed accept the theory which lay at the basis of each of the three Puritan sects, that the Churches still submitting to the Pope were no parts of the Church, but a great anti-Christian society. Laud had the vision of an infinitely larger and grander unity than a mere Evangelical Alliance, although his practical and businesslike mind was content for the time to attempt nothing larger than this. John Dury in his old age, thirty years after Laud's execution, published at Frankfort a commentary on the Apocalypse, in which he states that his view of the Pacification of the Church had at last widened to the generous extent of the view of the great prelate, and that no reunion "could be called Evangelical unless it embraced the Papists and all Greek Christians, and not merely the Protestants."

The third cause of the intense hatred of the Puritans to Laud was that the Archbishop was the active and successful protector of the social liberty of Englishmen in every direction in which the Puritans were striving to restrict that liberty. If no other "men of the nineteenth century" will speak for Laud, we may expect a generous lecture upon him from one of the Sunday League preachers, or a speech in his favour from Mr. Buckstone at some benevolent dinner for poor actors. His vindication of the Christian Sunday against the Scottish Sabbath, and his patronage of the drama, are constantly cited by the hot pamphleteers as the most wicked of his crimes after his "Arminianism," and his prohibition of the preaching of the comfortable doctrine of reprobation. Archbishop Laud is constantly accused, both by Vicars and Burton, of being as popular with the publicans and sinners as he was hateful to "godly ministers."

We are of course aware that these statements will appear certainly startling, and perhaps audacious, to all those who have lazily inherited (whether Churchmen or Puritans) a cut-and-dried estimate of this prelate. Nor is this to be much wondered at, since no one has yet written the history of the Archbishop's time who has had at once a fervid love for the political principles which the Puritans represented through their accidental alliances with the Parliament, and as fervid a love for the larger theology and larger social liberty against which the Puritans were contending, and against which they called in the help of the Parliament. Those aims of the Puritans which were Puritan are now rejected for ever. No Presbyterian or Independent or Anabaptist who wishes to have a decent following, or who makes the faintest pretence to intelligence, dares to make in modern England any one of the cries of his forefathers his own cry; but the great aims of Archbishop Laud are at this day the aims of every liberal and tolerant Englishman who calls himself a Christian, although he hopes to ensure these aims by better and more consistent means than the great prelate used.

COOK'S EXCURSIONIST.

WE desire to express our profound admiration for Mr. Cook. We admire his invention, his energy, his ubiquity, and, above all, his style. He does wonderful things, and he writes about them still more wonderfully. He has contrived and set to work a system of "hotel coupons" by which it is possible to travel on the Continent without troubling oneself to learn the denominations and the value of foreign money. This system appears to be now in active operation, but the negotiations which established it were beyond description arduous. Indeed the diplomatic skill and assiduity of Mr. Cook almost failed to surmount a difficulty which arose as to the "breakfast coupon." We learn from a recent number of the *Excursionist* that the only serious drawback to complete unanimity between tourists and hotel-keepers was in reference to this breakfast coupon, "the provisions of which were not on either side clearly understood." It occurs to us that if we could understand the provisions of the breakfast, we need not trouble ourselves about the coupon. We remember that in one of Scott's novels, bread, fruit, and wine are placed before a party of French visitors to London; and, in the absence of an interpreter, it is suggested that they will explain themselves. We must not, however, trifle with a subject which to many tourists may have been highly serious. Mr. Cook, giving an example of solemnity which we shall do our best to imitate, proceeds to state that the words "with meat and eggs" were not in many cases well understood. We will venture here to remark that our own understanding would be, that you eat as much meat as you can, and then fill up the interstices with eggs. We have heard a high authority declare that you can eat an egg at breakfast when you can find storage for nothing else. This, however, is irrelevant to the question which arose upon the breakfast coupon. Some of the hotel-keepers contended that they were bound to supply only cold meat, and might charge extra for hot meat, especially for beefsteaks. The consequence of this diversity of supply was "occasional dissatisfaction." As Mr. Cook mildly puts it, the prevention of altercation, which is one of the great objects of his system, was in some cases frustrated. It must have been pleasant to meet a party of Mr. Cook's tourists, who are usually not very expert in the use of foreign languages, at the moment when altercation could no longer be

prevented upon this exciting question of meat and eggs. But Mr. Cook, feeling the gravity of this international dispute, procured a meeting of Swiss hotel proprietors, by whom the question was settled by reducing the price of the breakfast coupon, and arranging that henceforward it should not entitle the bearer to either meat or eggs. The provisions of the revised coupon are extremely simple, since you only get for it tea or coffee, bread, butter, and honey; and if you desire meat or eggs, you must pay for them either in money or by "supplemental coupons," which Mr. Cook is ready to provide. These coupons may also be used for payment for "teas, lunches, or other light refreshment," and, in fact, they will soon become an international currency available for all tourists' purposes. In selecting hotels with which to make arrangements, Mr. Cook has sometimes turned to the largest and most pretentious houses, while at other times "unassuming comfort" has been his aim. In no cases have large establishments "with frigid management" been adopted. The expressiveness of this phrase, "frigid management," will not be lost upon attentive readers. It conveys to our minds that the meat would certainly be cold at breakfast, and perhaps also the eggs and coffee.

Besides issuing railway and steamboat tickets and hotel coupons, Mr. Cook personally conducts parties of tourists to the Continent, and in the pages of the *Excursionist* he announces future and describes past excursions. The settlement of the great meat and eggs question having removed the only drawback to "complete unanimity and general satisfaction," Mr. Cook can now proceed to bring all Southern Europe, and even parts of Asia and Africa, under the beneficent influence of the coupon system. He offers a boat up the Nile, or thirty days' "saddle and tent life" in Palestine, and, having made his coupons available as far East as Damascus, he now contemplates the more serious enterprise of moderating, for the benefit of those who place themselves under his care, the rapacity of Scottish innkeepers. Let us hope that he will succeed in Scotland as well as he has done in Switzerland, where, as he says, hotel life constitutes one of the great enjoyments of the country. The utmost freedom and fraternization exist. Every guest orders just what drink he or she desires. "Abstainers" are treated with respect; and "upon my hotel coupons all this comfort and elegance is secured for less than ten francs a day." There are some inconveniences in providing for a large party, but the social advantages counterbalance occasional pressure. Mr. Cook reports that a recent tour as a whole had been a very happy one. Once only there occurred what we will venture for the sake of brevity to call a row. At the "Trois Rois," Bâle, Mr. Cook's party of seventy was surrounded in the lobby by nearly as many outsiders, all anxiously waiting for the allotment of bedrooms. A little crossing of arrangements and misappropriation of rooms threw the whole into confusion, and led to expressions of anger which Mr. Cook desires may be obliterated from memory. As we are not informed by whom the expressions of anger were uttered, we can only infer that the seventy tourists of Mr. Cook's party, and an equal number of outsiders, scrambled for the bedrooms of the "Trois Rois," while the landlord and Mr. Cook looked on. "The excitement caused a little sorrow for the night, but joy came in the morning." It must be worth all the money to travel with Mr. Cook, in order to take lessons in the control of temper. As a guide to Switzerland he is at once practical and poetical. He appreciates equally "the lovely surroundings and superior provisions" of the Beau-Rivage at Ouchy. In passing through Belgium his party visited Waterloo, where "Miss Cotton furnished for the party a capital lunch." In the salon of the Rhine steamer they had a special dinner well provided. There was good eating and drinking and "easy freedom" everywhere, and Mr. Cook was always at hand, and ready either to negotiate with car-drivers or to quote Longfellow on occasion.

An autumnal tour to Italy, to be conducted by Mr. Cook, is advertised to start on September 6, and to continue a month. The comprehensive character of the arrangements may be inferred from a single specimen:—"Tuesday, 26th Sept., trip by carriages to Pompeii, calling by the way at Herculaneum." Mr. Cook's customers are manifestly of the active disposition of the American who arrived late at night at Moscow, and "did" the ancient capital of Russia before an English fellow-traveller had got out of bed. An admirer of Mr. Cook's arrangements writes to tell him how he spent two days in London. He started from Manchester at half-an-hour after midnight, by a train engaged by Mr. Cook, and reached London at 7 A.M. After breakfast the party to which he belonged visited successively Smithfield Market, Newgate Prison, the Holborn Viaduct, the Thames Embankment, Somerset House, Lambeth Palace, the Houses of Parliament, Westminster Abbey, and Rotten Row. "After seeing the nobility promenading, and on horseback and in carriages," they took omnibuses along Piccadilly to Trafalgar Square. "After inspecting the paintings of the National Gallery," they proceeded down the Strand to St. Paul's Cathedral, "being so fortunate as to arrive while the choral service was going on." After admiring the dome and statues, they looked in at a few booksellers' establishments in Paternoster Row, and then proceeded to the General Post Office, the Bank of England, the Royal Exchange, and the Mansion House. After tea, some of the party went by steamboat down the river to Greenwich and back. The next day was divided between the International Exhibition and the Crystal Palace, and at 11 P.M. the party started on their return to Manchester. We should think that this must be good training for a trip to Pompeii, calling by the way at Herculaneum.

It seems hardly worth while to visit Venice, Florence, Rome, Naples, Pisa, Genoa, Turin, and Paris within a month. But Mr. Cook will easily find people who would rather travel in this hasty way than not at all. They get at any rate plenty of change and movement, and they learn something even by travelling under the guidance of Mr. Cook. We think, however, that that enterprising person would do well to confine himself to the business which he has so successfully established. All gifts are not given to all men, and it may be doubted whether nature intended Mr. Cook to attain literary distinction. If the *Excursionist* must needs become a guide-book, it might be useful to engage some competent person to write descriptive passages. We do not question that a young woman marked with the small-pox and having a swelling under her chin may have been charming, at least in the opinion of a contributor to Mr. Cook's publication. But when we are told that this young woman lifted her large blue eyes to heaven, "eyes like diamonds," we venture to remark that diamonds are not often blue, though they are sometimes black. Mr. Cook mentions that he has on hand a large quantity of what printers call "copy," and, judging from the specimens he has given us, we think that he had better destroy the entire stock.

REVIEWS.

CLARKE'S RICHES OF CHAUCER.*

A MORE appropriate name could not have been chosen for this volume than the one inscribed on its title-page. The "Riches of Chaucer" are scarcely second to those of Shakespeare, whether we estimate them by their poetical or their historical amount. In his writings lie the seeds of the English drama, as it was destined to appear in the harvest-time of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. He is the best auxiliary to the chroniclers of his age; he, Froissart, and Monstrelet mutually throw light on one another. To Chaucer we owe nearly as clear a conception of the reigns of Edward III. and Richard II. as we obtain from the *Tallier* and *Spectator* of the reign of Queen Anne:—

The teacup times of hood and hoop
Or while the patch was worn;

or from Walpole's *Journals* and *Letters* of the intrigues, scandals, and pleasures of the time of the first two Georges.

The reasons for presenting Chaucer's works in this form are given in the preface to the first edition of the "Riches of Chaucer," and reprinted in the second. Of the many services rendered by Mr. Cowden Clarke to English literature, we account these selections from our earliest great poet the "roof and crown." The works of Chaucer should be familiar as household words to all who would cultivate English poetry, past as well as present. Great and manifold indeed are the poetic "Riches" of the present hour, yet it is not good, unless we are content with mere after-dinner or soiree prate about literature, to confine ourselves to brand-new coinage in verse. The past has claims on us no less than the present. It is an evil sign for any generation to flatter itself with being an Augustan age. On this theme Mr. Cowden Clarke is a sage adviser:—

Let not our poetry be quite forgotten; and, above all, our old poetry. Let not the eloquent simplicity—the only well-wearing eloquence, after all—(like simple mechanism) the sudden and electrical pathos of old Chaucer; the universal code of humanity of Shakespeare; the gentle fancy, languishing voluptuousness, and religiously poetical faith of Spenser; the divine affilation and Atlantic roll of Milton; let not the works of all these giants become the subject of mouth-honour only.

Yet the works of Chaucer cannot lie on our tables without some purgation and many excisions. The excisions are required for the same reasons that make it advisable to expunge a good deal from Congreve's or Vanbrugh's plays; and also because Chaucer's writings are so numerous, and some of them so long (to say nothing of their being tedious to modern readers, their *raison d'être* being long since lost), that in order to read them we should possess the leisure and longevity of Hilpa and Shalum, when manhood was thought to begin with the sixth-hundred year. And besides selecting what may still be read with pleasure, Mr. Cowden Clarke has rendered them easily intelligible to all who take pains to acquire as much of the poet's language as time or change has made obsolete or obscure—less pains indeed than are bestowed ungrudgingly on learning to construe a play of Schiller's.

The poetical "Riches of Chaucer" may be safely left for his readers to discover; the historical value of his works is less obvious and may justify a short notice. It requires no archaeological enthusiasm to recognise and assert the splendour of the period in which he lived. The first wars of the Barons were at an end; the germs of the second were not sown. South of the Tweed the arms and laws of the first Edward had subdued or united the Welsh and English peoples. The clergy were still powerful, but no Thomas à-Becket raised the banner of the Church against secular encroachments. The Great Charter defined and secured the liberty of the Barons and the Commons. Scotland was too much discouraged and depressed to be at the moment a formidable neighbour. The energy of the nation was turned from dissension at home to conquest abroad, or into the still more profitable channel of commerce and maritime adventure. Architecture flourished, as our cathedrals and churches testify to this day; the

* *The Riches of Chaucer*, &c. With a new Memoir of the Poet. By Charles Cowden Clarke. Second Edition. London: 1870.

illuminators of missals and books deserve the name of artists; the craftsmen who embellished the armour of the knights may rank with the most skilful of modern engravers. The rigours of feudalism were abated by Acts of Parliament; its rudeness was softened by the graces and courtesy of chivalry, then, both at home and abroad, as the pages of Froissart and the verse of Chaucer alike testify, in its most high and palmy state. Norman and Saxon were reconciled to each other; while the immigration of Flemish manufacturers laid the foundation of England's industrial superiority. The reign of Edward III., despite its costly wars, was a wall of separation between the turbulent periods that preceded and followed it, and Chaucer is its historian—the historian of the Court and the upper classes in his Poems, of middle and low life in his *Canterbury Tales*. The extraordinary fidelity of his portraits is well described by Hazlitt in his "Lectures on the Poets." "Chaucer's poetry," he says, "reads like history. Everything has a downright reality, at least in the narrator's mind. A simile is as if it were given in upon evidence." A portion of this praise is due to Crabbe, who is a kind of prosaic Chaucer; for where in Crabbe shall we find the cheerful and sympathetic spirit of the older poet? The one is the Hogarth of poetry, the other combines in his pictures the simplicity and vivid tints of Giotto with the veracity and humour of Teniers. Crabbe was "Nature's sternest painter"; Chaucer, like Shakespeare, contemplated and described nature in a more cheerful and more catholic mood. It is not always pleasant to accompany Crabbe in his rural walks. His *Tales of the Hall* and the *Borough* are seldom exhilarating, even if they make us wiser. There is too much of the Poorhouse and distraining for rent in them for cheerfulness; and his descriptions of woods and flowers and trim gardens rarely refresh the reader, or dispose him to envy the lot of those who dwell in hamlets. On the other hand, the cheerfulness and serenity of Chaucer's mind is never more apparent than when he leaves the precincts of the Court or towered cities and meditates among the shades of Windsor Forest, or strolls among hols and heaths or meadows diapered with May flowers. Usually he sets out upon his walk at early morning, while the grass is impeared by the dew, and the odours of tree, field, and flower are unimpaird by the heat and glare of noontide. His susceptibility to natural beauty displays itself in his most sorrowful no less than in his most joyous pictures. It appears in his "Elegy upon the Death of Princess Blanche," his constant and lovely friend, and breaks forth with peculiar lustre in the "Complaint of the Black Knight." His cheerfulness never deserts him. He was well stricken in years when his poem of the "Cuckow and the Nightingale" was composed. He is desirous, though then "old and un lusty," to hear the song of that sweet minstrel of the woods which he had not "herde of al that yere," though it was already "the thirde of Maye." Gilbert White is not more particular than Chaucer was in noting times and seasons for the bird's song or the swallow's flight. He goes forth—

And anon as I the day aspid,
No longer would I in my bed abide.
And unto a wodde that was faste by
I wente forth alone, boldly,
And held the waye down by a broked side,
Til I came to a launde of white and green,
So fayre an one had I never in beney;
The grounde was grene, y-powderd with daisy,
The flouris and the greves alike his
Al grene and white—was nothing elles sene.

For observing mankind the much-travelling Ulysses can hardly have enjoyed fairer opportunities than Chaucer. He visited many cities in an age when travellers met with few conveniences on their road, and often went with their lives in their hands. In the business of the time he was engaged to a degree unusual with poets, and, when not taking part in it, he was taking notes of what was good or evil before his eyes, of a waning past, of an actively growing present. He was an eyewitness of a rehearsal of the Reformation in the next century; he heard Wickliffe in the pulpit; he may have seen him when brought before the Council; he lent his aid to the disestablishment of a pompous and powerful Church by his satire on abbots, "purple as their vines," and on the vexations of their officials, the sompnours and limitours. His employment in the Customs brought him in contact with those who sold and those who bought the wool and fells of England, with the sheep-farmers of the Cotswold hills, and the cloth-weavers of Ghent, Arras, and Bruges. His duties at Court, where he was successively page, gentleman of the Privy Chamber, and shield-bearer to Edward III., introduced him to the highest circles of the time; he might have said, with as much reason as Horace did of himself, "*Principibus placuisse viris non ultima laus est*," since he was the intimate friend of John of Gaunt and his beautiful Duchess, the Lady Blanche, and the frequent companion of nobles whose names are inscribed on the pages of Froissart, and whose lances did good service on the fields of Cressy and Poitiers. He was certainly a student at the University of Cambridge and of the Inner Temple. His claim to be an Oxford man is more doubtful, yet there is no improbability in the rumour of his being so, since he dedicates his poem of "Troilus and Cressida" to his friends Gower and Strode, distinguished Oxonians; and Leland, who was indefatigably curious, and had good means of learning the truth, says that he studied at that University. An eminently prosperous gentleman was Geoffrey Chaucer, if one of his biographers, Speght, has rightly ascribed to him in his forty-seventh year the annual income of almost a thousand pounds, a sum at least equivalent to ten times the amount in our days.

He derived his wealth partly from lands and that profitable thing a Royal ward, and partly from his salaries and perquisites as shield-bearer and controller of Customs. Another royal and seasonable grant was a pitcher of wine daily. Chaucer was never poet-laureate; yet this pitcher is perhaps the ancestor of the well-known butt of sherry still awarded to the Court poet. To his comfortable circumstances he himself refers in "The Testament of Love," where he says, "I had comfort to be in that plight, that both profit were to me and my friends." Again, he avows that "in dignity of office he made gathering of those goods, and had a fair parcel for the time, in farthering of his sustenance, riches sufficient to waive necessity, dignity to be revered in worship, power to keep from enemies"; so that "he seemed to shine in glory of renown, as manhood asketh in men."

Nor was he fortunate in money and goods only, since at the discreet age of forty he married to his heart's content, and there is no reason to think that he ever repented of his bargain. It were perhaps inquiring too curiously to ask whether poets who remained bachelors have not been in general more at their ease than poets who have taken to themselves wives. Euripides is said to have turned woman-hater because one or both of his wives were vixens or worse. Dante had an ill-tempered partner—"la fiera moglie," jealous doubtless of his affection for Beatrice; for women are jealous of past or even ideal, as well as of living, rivals in wedlock. Shakespeare and his wife would seem to have agreed best apart from one another; Milton wanted a Divorce Act for his special use, and the merits of Elizabeth, his third wife, appear to have been like those of Rebecca, skill in making savoury meats such as his soul loved. Dryden is reported to have wished his wife an almanac, so that he might change her every year. Addison had an ill time of it with the Countess of Warwick, and Byron and his lady lived scarcely a year under one roof. Bachelor Gray, indeed, had a vexatious aunt, but he survived her; and Martha Blount occasionally put Pope beyond his patience. Chaucer, however, there is every reason to think, never regretted his marriage with Philippa, daughter of Sir Payne Rouet, a noble, or at least a gentleman of Hainault, and "guien king-at-arms for that territory." She may have brought him a fortune, since she was for several years attendant on Edward III.'s good Queen Philippa; nearer to his Court friends she certainly brought him, since her sister Catherine was John of Gaunt's—"time-honoured Lancaster's"—second wife.

But Chaucer's prosperity did not endure to the end. In Richard II.'s reign he shared in the fall of his friend, and by marriage his connexion, the Duke of Lancaster. It seems that the poet mixed himself up with that dangerous tribe of men, political or social reformers. He took part with one John Comberton, alias John of Northampton, a partisan of the Duke's, and moreover Lord Mayor of London. This was "worshipful" but not wholesome "society"; for this John, not content with one year of office, must needs make strong interest to be a second time returned to the Chair, on the pretence that he wished to reform certain abuses in the Corporation. There was a row in the City, in which Chaucer sided with Comberton. Some blood was shed; reforming John was sent to prison, and Geoffrey fled to Hainault, where his wife had friends, and afterwards, in dread perhaps of extradition, hid himself in France. As we have presumed to question the connubial felicity of poets, it is only fair to state that Philippa was his companion in exile. He returned to England, but there had lodgings found him for a while at the public expense, and was submitted to a severe cross-examination by the Privy Council. This, however, is the most obscure portion of the poet's life, and the details of it depend upon a right interpretation of the "Testament of Love." It is difficult, if not impossible, to extract from "the wimples and folds," as the author calls them, of this allegory, any probable chain of facts, and Mr. Cowden Clarke has not defended as well as he might have done Chaucer's good name. In place of a rather sophistical argument by Godwin, he might have availed himself of Sir Harris Nicolas's investigations. All that is certain is, that John of Northampton was put down by the clergy, and that Chaucer drew on himself the ill-will of a class of men, of yore as well as now, very powerful at elections. Mr. Godwin defends him against the charge of betraying his friends after the manner of Jaffier in *Venice Preserved*, and Mr. Cowden Clarke says that Chaucer

long evaded the object of drawing from him the betrayal of his associates. At length they informed him that his only chance of obtaining the Royal mercy was in exposing the secrets of his party. His tenacity of purpose now relaxed, and he disclosed all he knew, impeaching at the same time the persons who had been connected with him. This act in his life is the only one known that has in any degree tainted his memory, yet it is not to be dismissed without extenuation; and for this end we prefer availing ourselves of the cool philosophical and eloquent defence of Mr. Godwin, to any arguments that we could offer in behalf of one of the most eminent as well as most estimable beings on "Fame's eternal bead-roll."

But why resort to special pleading when facts will do as well, or even better? What, we ask, were the revelations made by Chaucer, and whom did he betray? Certainly not the Duke of Lancaster, nor John of Northampton, who received a full pardon in the following year. "The period of Chaucer's supposed misfortunes," observes the late Mr. Robert Bell in his "Life of the Poet," "was made to correspond with well-known public events in order to give it a colour of likelihood. John of Northampton was sent to Corfe Castle in 1384, and in 1384 Chaucer is stated to have fled. The Duke of Lancaster, after an absence of three years, returned to England in 1389, and in 1389, after an imprisonment of three years, Chaucer is liberated." This looks very

like "a concatenation accordingly." Not the least singular feature in this curious tale is the impossibility of discovering whom Chaucer injured by his indiscreet or base confessions. Soon his friends, instead of being as one might suppose in gail or hanged, returned to power, and, instead of resenting his conduct, took him again into favour. Among these uncertainties it is clear that John of Gaunt and Chaucer found it convenient to go abroad for a time. Had the feud between John of Northampton and the priest party taken place in a Greek Republic the losers would have been ostracized. And this perhaps is nearly the amount of all that happened to the Duke and his followers.

That Chaucer went abroad until the immediate storm blew over is almost the only certain fact in this part of his story. That he suffered loss from the negligence or knavery of his deputies at the Customs or his farm-bailiffs is also plain; and moreover his purse seems to have been ever open to his companions in exile. But after these points are settled comes the difficulty of the middle. Sir Harris Nicolas has shown that from 1380 to 1388 Chaucer was generally in London, or at least near enough to be found when wanted by those who wished to do him mischief—that is, the priest party, and Thomas of Woodstock, a man of Belial both to the poet and his sovereign Richard II. It is proved also that he held his offices at the Custom House up to December 1384, inasmuch as he drew his salary and other pensions at that time from the Exchequer. In February of the following year he was allowed to discharge his duties by deputy; this therefore may have been the time when he deemed it advisable to cross the water, and probably he was in Hainault, Zealand, or even in France in 1386. But again some troublesome date or entry perplexes us, since at the very moment when some of his biographers clap him into the Tower, he was in his place in Parliament as knight of the shire for one of the largest counties in England. Fortune again smiled on Chaucer, and although the latter end of his life was not better than the beginning—indeed, it could not well be more prosperous—he at least had no reason to complain of her treatment of him. But we must await some other opportunity for detailing his restoration to place and wealth, as well as for examining what influence he exerted on the literature of his own day, and on English poetry ever since.

HEFELE'S HISTORY OF COUNCILS.*

DR. HEFELE, Bishop of Rottenburg, and formerly Catholic Professor of Theology at Tübingen, is well known as the first scholar in the German episcopate. It is now several years since the publication of his *Concilien-geschichte* commenced, and the seventh volume of the original work, dealing with the Council of Constance, appeared some two years ago. It has supplied a desideratum, not only in German, but in modern literature generally; for it is no doubt true, as the author observes in the preface to his first volume, that from various causes "no part of Church history has been so much neglected in recent times"—we may add both by Catholic and Protestant writers—"as the history of the Councils." Very few persons have leisure or opportunity to examine the vast folios of Hardouin or Mansi, and moreover Bishop Hefele has not only reproduced in a readable form the substance of the information they contain, but has corrected and illustrated it by the lights of recent criticism. We cannot indeed always, as will presently appear, follow him in his interpretation of the evidence, nor are there wanting signs of modifications in his own opinion as the work proceeds; but his English translator does him no more than justice in saying that he is so fair in the statement of facts that every reader can easily draw his own conclusions. Mr. Clark's translation only carries us down to the Council of Nice, but, considering how many English readers there are to whom a German work is practically a sealed book, we trust that he may find sufficient encouragement to induce him to continue his labours; the more so as we still have nothing like an original Church history in English *nach den Quellen bearbeitet*, notwithstanding Milman's brilliant contribution to the subject. At the same time the present volume has an independent value of its own, not only for the exceptional importance, both historically and theologically, of the first (Œcumenical) Council, but also from its containing a very learned and carefully compiled introduction on the nature and regulations of Synods, as well general as local. For Dr. Hefele does not confine himself to Œcumenical Councils. The first three chapters of his history are devoted to the local Synods anterior to the Council of Nice, and these began to be held about the middle of the second century. He further distinguishes "General Councils," which represent the whole Latin or the whole Eastern Church, from "universal or Œcumenical Councils" of the whole Church—a distinction which ought to exclude all, or nearly all, the mediæval Councils from the latter category. And he gives as the final test of a Council being Œcumenical, which can only therefore be ascertained after the event, its receiving "the approval of the whole Church," not merely of the Pope. This test, he observes, excludes the *Latrocinium* of Ephesus, though duly convoked and presided over by Papal Legates. It is remarkable that none of the six grounds here enumerated for the convocation of Œcumenical Councils could possibly apply to the recent Synod of the Vatican.

We have said that, while Dr. Hefele is strictly accurate and honest in his statement of facts, we cannot always follow him in his conclusions. This is exemplified in three of the points discussed in the introductory chapter, on the right of summoning Councils, of presiding over them, and of confirming their decrees. We are told quite truly, that "the first eight Œcumenical Synods were convoked by the Emperors; all later ones"—that is, of course, the Latin Councils—"by the Popes." Nevertheless the author is anxious to save the later claims of the Holy See by insisting that in every case the Pope was consulted. This, if true, would prove very little, for it was at least as natural that the Emperor should consult the first Bishop of Christendom on such a matter as that the English Government should consult the Archbishop of Canterbury about an ecclesiastical measure to be introduced into Parliament. But there is, in fact, no proof whatever of the Popes being consulted, though in some cases, as that of Leo I. after the *Latrocinium*, they requested the Emperor to summon a Council, and even then their requests were not always complied with. The only shadow of proof alleged, for instance, in the case of the Nicene Council, is the bare assertion of the sixth Œcumenical Council, which met three centuries and a half afterwards, and the vague statement of Rufinus, who was not born till twenty-five years after the Council, that Constantine summoned it *ex sacerdotum sententia*. Both testimonies are of course absolutely worthless. So again as to the presidency of Councils; the Papal Legates certainly did not preside at Nice, and there is no proof whatever that Hosius presided as the Pope's representative. At two or three only of the first eight Councils did the Papal Legates preside, nor was this claimed as a right. Neither is it correct to say that "the decrees of the ancient Councils were confirmed by the Emperors and the Popes." There is no proof of any Papal confirmation before the fourth Œcumenical Council; but of course it was natural that the decrees should be sent to any of the Patriarchs not present at the Synod for his approval, and especially to the chief Patriarch, which is a very different thing from making his confirmation essential to their validity. As regards the Council of Nice applying for such a confirmation, Dr. Hefele admits that the story rests on a set of spurious documents, probably forged in the sixth century. And even as regards the fourth Council, which asked Pope Leo to confirm its decrees, the 28th Canon, which he expressly refused to sanction, became law equally with the rest, in spite of his refusal. This does not seem to bear out the assertion that "an assembly of bishops is no longer an Œcumenical Council when separated from the Pope," or that we have no right to inquire whether a Pope is above or below a Council. On the other hand, Dr. Hefele maintains that a Council may depose a Pope for heresy, though not for immorality. But, if so, the Council judges his faith, and therefore is clearly a higher authority in matters of faith. There is much interesting information about the composition of Councils, especially as to the part taken by the inferior clergy and by laymen, about which Hefele's conclusions are substantially accordant with Maret's, whose work on Councils we reviewed last year. It appears that the custom of admitting both clergy and laity to Church Synods was introduced by St. Cyprian as early as the middle of the third century, but neither the laity (*laici stantes*) nor the clergy seem to have had a decisive vote. Sometimes, however, priests and deacons subscribed the decrees, as at the Council of Arles, and when appearing as representatives of their bishops they were allowed to vote. This was refused, by the way, to the proctors of absent bishops at the Vatican. It has always been usual to invite the attendance of doctors of theology and canon law, and at Pisa and Constance they were allowed to vote. As late as 1736, at the great Maronite Council held by Asemam as Papal Legate, many laymen of distinction were present, and at several Synods they have even signed the Acts. And in this capacity, as representing the laity, Emperors have taken a prominent part in Œcumenical, and Kings in national, Synods. Dr. Hefele is least satisfactory in his enumeration of Œcumenical Councils, among which he strangely enough includes the French Synod of Vienna (1311), infamous alike for its method of procedure and for its iniquitous decrees, and Julius II.'s hole-and-corner Italian Synod of the fifth Lateran; while, on the other hand, he excludes the far more respectable Council of Pisa, which Gallican divines have ever recognised, and all but the last four Sessions of Constance. Here, however, also his conscientious statement of facts will enable an intelligent reader to revise his inferences for himself.

The local Synods before the Council of Nice are not for the most part of any great permanent interest. Many of them are concerned with the time of keeping Easter, and the controversy about the rebaptism of heretics. On the latter point the African Church followed a different practice from the Roman, and declined to change it. But, although the Roman practice was eventually authorised by the universal Church, St. Augustine expressly defends St. Cyprian for adhering to his own usage in spite of the dogmatic sentence of Pope Stephen, on the ground that as yet no *plenarium Concilium* had settled the matter. And it is worth observing that the "plenary Council" referred to must have been the purely Western Synod of Arles, which nevertheless Augustine regarded as a superior authority to the Pope. Pagi's suggestion that he may have referred to Nice is inadmissible, for there is no canon of Nice bearing directly on the subject. Hefele calls attention to the spurious account of the pretended Synod of Sinuessa in 303, which is still incorporated into the Roman Breviary, for the sake of the statement—conspicuous to every scholar as a grotesque anachronism—*prima sedes non judicatur a quoquam*. But the

* *A History of the Christian Councils, from the Original Documents, to the Close of the Council of Nicæa*. By C. J. Hefele, D.D. Translated from the German by W. R. Clark, M.A. Edinburgh: Clark. 1871.

main interest of the present volume, apart from the introductory matter, centres in the full account given of the antecedents and history of the great Council of Nice. We cannot linger here over the author's lucid exposition of the origin and significance of the Arian heresy, but we may observe that his estimate of the merits of the controversy carried on between Petavius and Bishop Bull about the testimony of the ante-Nicene Fathers is a very just one. Dr. Newman had already called attention in his *History of the Arians* to the peculiar method devised by their leader for spreading his opinions, first by means of his *Thalia*, partly written in verse, and then by composing songs for popular use, so as to familiarize the masses with his doctrine. Arius had anticipated the penetration of the statesman who said that, if he might write the nation's ballads, he cared little who made their laws. It was in great measure by this means that Christians became split up into two parties in every town and even in villages; and that their divisions were so notorious as to be turned into derision on the heathen stage. And these practical and quasi-political results of the controversy first attracted the attention of Constantine, whose letter addressed to Bishop Alexander and Arius, and preserved in substance by Eusebius, is an admirable illustration of Gibbon's famous sarcasm about the statesman's appreciation of creeds. The dispute itself appeared to him vulgar, puerile, and unworthy of the gravity of priests, but it was essential that the peace of the Empire should not be disturbed by the fierceness of theological brawlers. And hence, on finding his pacific advice ineffectual, he summoned the Council of Nice.

No two accounts of the Council could well be more unlike than Dr. Hefele's and Dean Stanley's, in the latter of which the picturesque incidents of the Assembly—the local scenery, the costume, characteristics, and antecedents of the various bishops, and the ceremonial of the Synod—completely overshadow the importance of the subject-matter under discussion. Into the doctrinal controversy we do not propose to enter here. But besides the Nicene Creed the Synod was occupied with the Quartodeciman question, the Meletian schism, and certain disciplinary canons. The Meletian schism in Egypt—a far less important affair than the schism of the same name which distracted the Church of Antioch half a century later—need not detain us, except to observe that the Council showed a singular and commendable mildness in its method of dealing with the offenders. The history of the Paschal controversy is curious in itself, and as exemplifying the practical importance of what are often deemed as mere trumpery quarrels about “accidents” or “uniform.” Putting aside the Ebionites, who were never a very important sect, there was absolutely no doctrinal principle whatever even remotely involved in the dispute. Yet the Quartodeciman controversy may be said to have rivalled the Arian, both in duration and potency, as a solvent of the peace of the Church. The original difference was this, that the Westerns kept Good Friday either on the 14th Nisan, if it fell on a Friday, or, if not, on the Friday after, and Easter Day on the following Sunday. The orthodox Quartodecimans and the Ebionites agreed in disregarding the day of the week, and always observed the 14th Nisan, on whatever day it might fall, as the anniversary of the death of Christ; but while the Ebionites grounded their practice on the perpetual obligation of the Jewish law, the Quartodecimans, or as they are sometimes called *Johanneans*, observed the 14th Nisan as being the actual day of the Crucifixion, and appealed to the example of St. John the Evangelist. At first the difference was not looked upon as vital on either side; but by the end of the second century Pope Victor embittered the matter by his haughty threat to excommunicate the Churches of Asia, which Eusebius expressly says that he “tried” to carry out, but Irenæus and other bishops resisted him. In the third century, however, the question became still further complicated by astronomical difficulties about fixing the date of the 14th Nisan, which it would take us too long to explain in detail here. Hence different rules and cycles were laid down for adoption in different Churches, and the bitter disputes arising from these divergences exposed the Christians to the ridicule of the heathen; and the importance of following a uniform practice is dwelt on at great length in the letter issued by Constantine after the Council of Nice. Yet the Council did not succeed in establishing this uniformity. Rome and Alexandria could not agree in their calculations the very next year, and the subject was again taken up by the Synod of Sardica in 343, but again with very indifferent success. In 387, when the Romans had kept Easter five weeks before the Alexandrians, the Emperor Theodosius took fresh steps to bring about an agreement, but it was not till more than a century later that this was finally accomplished by the acceptance of a common cycle drawn up by Dionysius the Less. This cycle, however, was not received in Gaul or Great Britain, and hence arose the famous dispute between St. Augustine and the British bishops, who were not, as is sometimes fancied, Quartodecimans, but had never accepted, and probably never heard of, the latest canon for the regulation of Easter adopted in the South. It was only under Charlemagne that it was universally accepted throughout Christendom. To complete the history we may observe that the Gregorian Calendar, introduced in 1582 by Gregory XIII. to correct the erroneous calculation of the duration of the year, which was at once received in all Catholic countries, was long rejected by Protestant countries, and has never been accepted in the East, so that the Russian and Greek Churches by a strange fatality still keep their Easter at a different time from their Western brethren. It

is also curious that the Gregorian Calendar occasionally makes the Christian Easter coincide with the Jewish Passover, as occurred in 1825. This was expressly forbidden by the Council of Nice, on account probably of the Judaizing tendencies of the Ebionites, but it is of course unavoidable.

Dr. Hefele quotes and examines at length the twenty genuine Nicene canons; that these alone have any claim to be so considered he has proved *abundantly*. Most of them have long since become obsolete, but some few have a permanent historical interest. The famous sixth canon, on the patriarchal rights of Alexandria and Antioch, into the Latin copies of which *Ecclesia Romana semper habuit primatum* was afterwards interpolated, not only “cannot be used to demonstrate the primacy of the Pope,” but—at least if primacy is understood in its modern sense of supremacy—very decidedly, though indirectly, demonstrates the reverse. It places the patriarchal jurisdiction of the Roman Patriarch *in pari line* with that of his Eastern colleagues. The ingenious explanation of its wording suggested by a certain Dr. Maassen, which Dr. Hefele cites “simply as a theory,” is too absurd to deserve even a passing reference. As regards the decision of the Council about the Meletians and Novatians, as laid down in the eighth canon, our author points out that it does not prescribe the reordination of schismatical priests, as has sometimes been supposed, and as Gratian, writing in the twelfth century, and after the marvellous blunderings and contradictions of several Popes on the subject, chose to misconstrue the words. He also shows that the Council made no attempt to impose the law of celibacy on the East, or to forbid those married before ordination from continuing to cohabit with their wives. The volume concludes with a learned and exhaustive dissertation on the so-called Apostolic canons, eighty-five in number, which will be of interest to ecclesiastical students. It is only fair to add that Mr. Clark has done his work as a translator very satisfactorily. We have, however, observed some rather unaccountable inaccuracies not included in the list of *errata*, as, for instance, rendering in the same sentence *καὶ ἄλλοι* “other,” and *οἱ πολλοὶ* “many.” For purposes of reference the book will be of great value to those who cannot conveniently consult the original.

A BATCH OF SMALL SCHOOL BOOKS.*

ABOUT six months ago we made a clearance of a large heap of small books, bearing on historical and philological matters, which had gradually gathered upon us. Since then another large crop has sprung up, all of them, it would seem, the fruit of the present year. Some of them are in their second and third editions; and of Mr. Bigsby's *Catechism of the History of the English Language*, it appears that we are now grappling with one of its fifth thousand. This shows what a hydra it is we are fighting against, and we begin to fear lest our own strength should not be enough for the work—lest we should have to call in Iolos to help. If we rightly remember the legend, that worthy burnt off the stumps as his companion beat off the heads, and this is exactly what we should like to find some one to do for us. We are vain enough to believe that we have done some little in the way of breaking heads in pieces, but for want of a confederate to burn the stumps, they seem ever to spring up again. Whence these books come and whither they go we have no means of guessing, but as a matter of fact here they are. The supply seems inexhaustible; it is plain that people buy them, and therefore we suppose that they read and teach them. Here, for instance, is Mr. Bigsby; if he has not attained to the hundreds of thousands of the great Butter, he is at least in his second edition and his fifth thousand, which seems to imply a sale of four thousand copies, or at the very least two thousand five hundred. Who our instructors may be we are still in the dark. Mr. Grant indeed has a long string of official titles after his name. He is Rector of Hitcham, Honorary Canon of Ely, late H.M. Inspector of Schools, and formerly Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge. Of Mr. Bigsby, F.A.S.L., we learn from one of his prefaces that he “has officiated in his professional capacity of Lecturer on English Literature and Composition in several of the higher class of our public and private schools.” He also speaks of “R. Bigsby,” as an eminent philologist, a class which includes a rather long list of names, from Johnson—we presume the great Samuel—to Alfred—possibly the late Dean of Canterbury. Our Bridlington friend gives no account of himself whatever, but H. M. L., who dates from “the College of Arms, London, E.C.,” helps us to a curious autobiographical sketch. The “Chronological Sketch” was the production of a boy of twelve years of age, and the proceeds of its

* *The School Managers' Series of Reading Books Adapted to the Requirements of the New Code of 1871.* Edited by the Rev. A. R. Grant, M.A. Third, Fourth, and Sixth Standard. London: Lockwood & Co. 1871.

A Catechism of the History of the English Language. Compiled for the Use of Candidates for the Oxford and Cambridge, Local, and Indian Civil Service Competitive Examinations. By B. E. S. Drake Bigsby. London: Murby.

A Practical Help to Teaching English Composition. By B. E. S. Drake Bigsby, F.A.S.L. London: Murby. 1871.

A Short Abstract of the History and Science of the English Language. Bridlington: Taylor. 1871.

A Chronological Sketch of the Kings of England, from the Conquest to the Present Reign, with Anecdotes for the Use of Children. By H. M. L. London: Washbourn. 1871.

sale when it first appeared were dedicated to the restoration of an Anglican church." "Since attaining to man's estate the author has had the happiness of becoming a Catholic. The present edition of this little work has therefore been amended and corrected, so as to adapt it for circulation in Catholic schools and families." This last we find is bound up with *A Chronological Sketch of the Kings of France*, written on the same principle, over which we will not tarry longer than to make two extracts from the last page:—"In exile as on the throne—in adversity, as in prosperity, Napoleon the Third, both as a man and a prince, is admirable." "May Napoleon the Third—more fortunate than his renowned predecessor (whose last wish was eventually fulfilled)—return ere long, with his amiable and gracious Empress, to the banks of the Seine, and restore Peace, Concord and Happiness to the Great People of France." For the rest we will only say that it is written in a style that was pardonable in a boy of twelve years.

The works of Mr. Grant, as those of a former Inspector of Schools, and formerly Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge, are of more importance. In them we seem to have very nearly reached the lowest depth, at least if the lowest depth is to be measured by the amount of opportunities which have been thrown away. Mr. Bigsby makes the greater amount of positive blunders, but he is at least striving after better things. Mr. Bigsby at least sees that there are new lights, though he has not as yet spied out very much by their help; but on Mr. Grant no glimmering of light seems to have ever shone. His books—his six standards, designed, we suppose, for six progressive classes of scholars—are a collection of scraps, extracts, and passages of all kinds, of which we shall not meddle with any except those which in some way touch history, language, or geography. Amongst these, however, there is something like a history of England from the beginning of things, as well as a description of most parts of the world in their present state. Here are the opportunities thrown away. Mr. Grant evidently underrates the capacities of children; we suspect that he falls into the common error which underlies most books of this kind—namely, that because the teacher cannot understand things, therefore the child cannot understand them. He forgets that a child has nothing to unlearn, nothing to forget, both of which processes would doubtless be largely useful to Mr. Grant. The child therefore has no difficulty whatever in taking an accurate and scientific view of things, because such a view is really easier than an inaccurate and unscientific view. The child has no difficulty in understanding the clear and simple nomenclature which puzzles his teachers, because he has no confused nomenclature to throw away to make room for it. We light on the following at a shot. Mr. Grant gives a description of Holland, in which he tells us that "the Dutch language is not pretty, but sounds like bad German and broken English." Now what kind of idea would a child carry away from such nonsense as this? He will most likely be set up for life, not only with a blunder, but, worse than a blunder, with a prejudice. Yet nothing can be easier than to explain to a child the true relations between the kindred tongues of England and Holland, if only the teacher understands so simple a matter himself. Then again, what can be the use of telling children that "the Belgians used to belong to Holland, but many years ago they would have a King of their own, and they chose a Prince named Leopold, &c."? No one would guess from this that the union of the two countries had lasted only fifteen years. How far a child could be made to understand the subtleties of the new German Imperial Constitution is another matter; but surely a nearer approach could be made to it than by saying in the description of Germany, "Government—a King." In Switzerland Mr. Grant has at least got beyond Chief-Justice White-side, who believed that Switzerland was a Confederation of small Kingdoms, as we find, "Government—Republican. That means that the people rule themselves, and have no King." Whether this could have been accepted as a definition of a Republic in the days of the Bernese oligarchy may be doubted; but at any rate it is odd when we read directly afterwards, "but a little bit of Switzerland now belongs to the French." Mr. Grant has perhaps seen the misleading phrase of "French Switzerland" used to express *la Suisse romande*, and he has leaped to the conclusion that some part of Switzerland must be under French dominion. We do not know whether the inhabitants of the once French villages which now form part of the Canton of Geneva would put the matter the other way. One thing, however, is remarkable—namely, that though Mr. Grant's book is published in 1871, none of the great events of 1870 seem to have come to his knowledge. Besides the odd statement that a King of France was put to death in the year 1792, which might lead us to think that Mr. Grant has not yet adopted the new style, we read, "Now the French have an Emperor who was chosen by vote; but not many years ago he was living in London without much money and with few friends." In Spain, we read:—

The Queen of Spain, who is a superstitious and not very good woman, has left her throne, and I hope that the people will be rather better governed by some of the wisest men in Spain than they were by the Queen. They think of having a king, but have not quite settled about it.

And it is funnier still when we are told under the head of Italy that—

This lovely country does not all belong to one king. The capital city is Rome, and it and the surrounding country belong to the Pope, who is the chief bishop of the Roman Catholic Church.

Still it is something to be told in the next page that, "besides the part of Italy called the Papal States, and which belongs to the Pope, there is the Kingdom of Italy." It is odd also to read "that in Greece clever writing is now all over," and that "the Greeks have even forgotten their own language." We should be rather inclined to complain that they remember it somewhat too well. Sweden and Norway "are governed by one King, the King of Sweden; but the Norwegians are allowed to settle a little about the laws of their own country." But, after all, what are we to expect from our late Inspector of Schools and Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge, with regard to the affairs of other countries, when all that he has to say about the British House of Commons is that "the Commons are chosen from among the 'common' people by votes"? After this we may perhaps be excused from going in detail through a History of England by the same hand; but we cannot help mentioning three statements at the very beginning—that Caesar, when he came into Britain, had conquered France; that the Britons probably became Christians through the French; and that at the time when Caesar came into Britain, Rome was governed by him.

Mr. Grant, except in his curious statement about the Nether-Dutch tongue, does not seem to meddle with language at all; but language is of course Mr. Bigsby's special subject. Our standard in these matters is so very low that we are pleased to find a man who has some sort of notion of the relations of Aryan languages to one another and to other tongues. It is something for a man to begin at the beginning, even though the beginning of his own book is after this fashion:—

Q. How did man become possessed of the power of Language?

A. Philologists differ in their opinion. Some say that he invented language; others, that he was taught it by an angel, as an especial act of grace from God; but the true account is, that it was made part of his being at the creation. Man spoke a language by nature; as he breathed or heard.

Q. What reasons are there for believing this?

A. Because in the Garden of Eden, when God bade Adam name the animals, He did not tell him what to call them, but left it to him to apply whatever names he deemed most fitting. Also we read of God talking with Adam; and of Satan talking with Eve, and by the persuasive eloquence of his language inducing her to sin.

We should greatly like to know where in the Book of Genesis—and we can admit no more modern authority—Mr. Bigsby learned that Satan talked with Eve.

Mr. Bigsby, then, has the great advantage of having a general glimmering of the relations of things to one another; but here our praise must stop. It is really strange that a man who has got so far as this—and by comparison with many people it is really getting a good way—should have so systematically blundered in nearly every detail. It is funny that a man who has got thus far should go on through page after page talking about the words "which we have derived from the Anglo-Saxon," this or that—be the etymologies themselves right or wrong—as if "we" were somebody else borrowing from some other people. But the derivatives throughout the book are among the very funniest which we ever came across. Among "Hebrew words commonly used in the English language," Mr. Bigsby reckons "as, an animal." Among Latin words, *posthumous* is made to come from *humus*. Among Greek roots used in English we have "Charis, love, as in charity," and "Thuo, I am ardent, as in enthusiasm." Then we have pages of words "derived from the Anglo-Saxon," some of the derivations being right and some wrong, but all put according to the same misleading formula. Mr. Bigsby makes short work of the two puzzling words *Hieford* and *Hlefdige*:—

Q. What have we derived from the A.-S. *HLIFAN*, to raise on high?

A. Lofty, raised on high.

Lady, a lofty person.

Also we get lord from the Saxon *hlaf*, high, and the Latin *ortus*, born.

This last reminds us of our own model derivation many years back, of Lambeth, the dwelling-place of Primates, so happily called by joining the Mongolian *Lama* and the Semitic *Beth*. One more specimen we must give. "Tooth, Theog-ian, to tug. Hence *toogeth*, or *tooth*, that which tugs." On this some cavillers have observed that a tooth cannot so well be said to tug as itself to be tugged when it falls into the hands of the dentist. We wonder whether it ever came into Mr. Bigsby's mind that that gloomy functionary and the part on which he operates, together with King Harold Blaataud and Rowland's Odonto had anything to do with one another. Then we come to a good deal about the Celts, the Romans, the Saxons, "the Norse" and the Norman French, among whom two things are remarkable. "The Norse were a fierce race of warriors. They rode to battle on horses, which they managed with such dexterity, that the terrified Saxons thought they were a race of centaurs." Also it was in the reign of Queen Elizabeth "that the Saxon tongue became the fixed basis of our parlance." We turn over a few pages and get into Synonyms, many of which are very strange, but on the whole we think the following is the strangest:—

Q. Explain *play*, *game*, and *sport*.

A. *Play*—French *plaire*, to please—means to do something to please one's self.

Game—Greek *gameo*, to marry, which is the season for games.

Sport—Greek *speitzo*, to jest.

Play is unsystematic; *game* is a systematic play. Children *play* when they run after each other, but this is no game. *Sport* is a bodily or mental exercise. We *played* a game at cricket, which was very good *sport*.

Besides the good English *plega* being traced up to French *plaire*, and no less good English *gamen* being traced up to Greek *γᾱμν*, the etymon of *sport* is quite beyond us. Mr. Bigsby's spelling led

us even to look in a modern Greek dictionary to see whether there were any such half-barbaric word as *anastasis*, but our search has been in vain. After a little while we come to names of persons, among which we are surprised to learn that Anthony is a Greek name, from "*anthos*, a flower," while Ernest is from the Latin "*ernestus*, earnest." Alfred is from "*æl*, all, and *frede*, peace—all peace." Alas for the kind *elves* by whose wise *rede* the great King was guided through all his dangers! A distinction quite beyond us is drawn between two closely kindred names:—

Edward *ead*, blessedness, and *aerd*, nature—happily disposed.
Edgar *aedig*, happy, and *are*, honour—happy in honour.

One more specimen as an example of the ingenuity with which a derivation may be found for a name which never existed. "*Rowna*—*roum*, peace, and *ruian*, to acquire." All this we should think must lead to some very strange answers in the "Oxford and Cambridge, Local, and Indian Civil Service Competitive Examinations."

So much for those writers whose works are printed in London. Our Bridlington friend really gets beyond us, when he gets to "Pronominal, Quantitative, and Qualitative Adjectives," and tells us how "in the logical division of words it is either the significant part of the predicate or the attribute of the subject, and it admits of expansion into participle and prepositional phrases, and the adjective clause." We get more within our own beat when we are told that "from the Scandinavian mixed with the classical comes the *Langue d'Oc*, which died out, and the *Langue d'Oyl*, which merged into Norman French." The Scandinavian origin of either *Oc* or *Oyl* sounds rather odd, and we are happy to think that if the tongue of *Oc* has died out, it has died out within a very few years. As for our own tongue, we learn that—

The basis of the English language is *Anglo-Saxon*, into which has been grafted a great number of words from classical and other sources. Classical words have been introduced at four distinct periods:—(1) Roman (A.D. 50 to 450), (2) Ecclesiastical (about 600 A.D.), (3) Norman French (1066 A.D.), (4) the Revival of Learning (15th century).

We should like to know something about the Roman words which were introduced into English about A.D. 50. B.C. 10, when Drusus reached the Elbe, would have been a far more promising date to fix on.

UGONE.

IF a first novel is a hard undertaking, a first drama is a great deal harder still. We have imported into our descriptions and criticisms of the modern novel so many terms more properly applicable to the drama, that the distinctions between the production of drama and novel do not readily occur at first sight. Yet they are very real distinctions notwithstanding. Into the construction of the novel delineation of character must naturally enter in a large degree; description, whether of person or scenery, is an important element; but narrative is after all the staple. In a word, the best novelist is the best *raconteur*; but a good dramatist must have many of the intellectual qualities of a great painter. What De Quincey has remarked of the Greek stage is true in its degree of the purpose and intention of all the higher drama. It aims, or should aim, at portraying not human character only, but human destinies as well; it should develop, with more completeness than the novel can do, the mutual working and dependency of situations in which the will has power and influence, and of those where it has none. We all know that the fatalist element was stronger than the human in *Æschylus* and *Sophocles*, and that the opposite is the case in *Shakespeare*; which is no more than to say that the *Shakespearean* and post-*Shakespearean* drama is a far more complex thing than the Greeks were aware of. Whatever new complications the modern novel may impose upon itself, they will still be distanced by those which are essential to the drama; and, while the novelist is relieved by intervals of necessary description, the writer of drama, without any such relief except what may be suitably conveyed in the utterances of one or more speakers, has to sustain vitality, movement, and action at a much higher point.

A drama which was never designed for the stage, and which is, definitely permitted to exceed stage limits, carries with it new elements of difficulty. Stage requirements impose certain constant conditions, and force on the dramatist restrictions the neglect of which entails a loss of vitality and effect. Perhaps the only dramas of this kind that have a real chance of permanence are the few which present the living features, not only of an individual, but of an age or a crisis. *Philip van Artevelde*, for instance, deserves a recognition and remembrance even more general than it has actually received. Each of its two parts far exceeds acting limits in length; but in reading it one has the sense, not only of witnessing the evolution of a great character, first in its strength and then in its wayward decline, but also of acquiring a grasp upon the real mainstays of Flemish history in the fourteenth century; just as in *St. Clement's Eve* we get sound and good art, with the results into the bargain of an historian like *Barante*. But these are the exceptions; and, speaking generally, a play which exceeds acting limits is a harder thing to maintain at a high level than one which keeps within them.

Another extra difficulty arises when, by the mere force of the imagination, without at any rate the supplemental colouring fur-

nished by history, characters have to be developed and situations arranged in the midst of a foreign society. The same difficulty has been remarked in novels. Notwithstanding the energetic power and the close investigation of well-managed detail that characterize *Romola*, few people would be disposed to deny that the genius of George Eliot scarcely shows itself to the best advantage in that novel. Movement and dialogue alike are trammelled; and the impression left is less that of spontaneous creation than of a fine *tour de force*. The effect is inadequate in comparison with the elaborate toil which must necessarily have been expended. And what is true of novels is true *à fortiori* of dramatic work.

Ugone labours under each and all of the difficulties on which we have been remarking. The story on which it is based might have been thrown into the form of a novel, set off with Italian scenery and surroundings (for most of the characters, greater and lesser, are Italian), and belonging to the class represented by Mr. T. A. Trollope's *Beppo*. But Mr. Armstrong has thought more of his characters than of his scenery, and, preferring to give the widest field for the development of the human element in his work, has adopted the dramatic form, and permitted himself to exceed by a very great deal the ordinary acting limits. Bearing these conditions in mind, we do not hesitate to say that the result has been a book of no inconsiderable mark and promise. The faults are many, and the immaturity obvious; but the analysis is good and forcible, and is seconded by power and flexibility of language.

Ugone Bardi, the hero of the drama, is a young Italian, with very blue blood and genuine Southern mettle, together with feelings and manners of independence bred during a boyhood passed in England. At the time of the supposed action, most of which is laid in Milan or on the shores of the *Maggiore*, he is tortured to the verge of madness by a great wrong done to his house in the person of his father, and the social consequences of which he is smarting under. An old schemer, Count *Teodolfo*, with his natural son, Count *Rocco Fiore*, has in past days beggared and exiled *Bardi* the elder, now deceased. And *Ugone*, the son, though by birth entitled to mingle with the *grandees* of Milan, finds himself met at every turn by that sort of cold or patronizing treatment which makes an injury fester rapidly, and keeps revenge awake. *Rocco* is the evil genius of the play, who, with a decorous and almost sanctimonious exterior, adds to his many other sins by seducing the *Marchesa Narzia*, and *Cecilia*, the young sister of *Ugone*, driving both his victims upon an untimely end. The only human thing about him is his attachment to his *non-disant* uncle, the Count *Teodolfo*. That this attachment is not all simulated, but is part and parcel of the curious tangle of good and bad that makes a ghastly dualism in many a criminal nature, is well drawn out in some lines which follow. They are spoken after the deaths of the pair, and give a fair example of the analytical capacity which was mentioned before:

Then, each slave to each,
And, finding help through love, each loved each.
Nor either to himself was wholly known;
For either had a conscience craving peace,
So blinded conscience, self from self to hide.
Nor, when they sinned, seemed often sin as sin,
But mostly righteous; for no impulse led
Without the show of reason, and the seal
And superscript of conscience easily won.
So lived they false; bad lives: not wholly foul
With evil at the heart, but just so good
That their ill deeds a blacker name must bear
Than deeds of baser men.

The wrath of *Ugone*, which forms the principal strain for the action of the drama, is of course crossed by his love. He has become the slave of an English girl, moving in Milanese society with her father, Lord *Halden*; and his love has met with a genuine return. But she will hear of no revengeful schemes, and employs her supreme influence in weaning *Ugone* to more patient and collected thoughts on the subject of the demon *Rocco*. Her relation to this young lover, a man as he is of splendid promise but of broken fortunes, is well set off by the introduction of another figure on the scene, that of the *Marquis d'Arno*. For every frown that *Fortune* has given to *Ugone*, she has bestowed a smile on *Arno*; wealth and a great place in society mark him out for *Adelaide*, and he is her father's close friend. Withal he is generous, and, upon learning from *Adelaide*'s own lips the failure of his hopes, he displays from that moment a large-hearted and disinterested fidelity to her service and fortunes which is kept well clear of weakness, and is so drawn as to make a worthy and welcome contrast to the devilry of *Rocco*.

The drama, as far as mere event goes, is gloomy enough. The evil genius, who inhabits occasionally a villa on the *Maggiore* adjoining the home of *Ugone*, contrives to win and ruin the young daughter of the *Bardi* family; and, after finding her dead body in the lake, *Ugone* tracks and kills him in the outlying woods. It is here that the dramatic working halts considerably. Nobody, in reading the *Spanish Gipsy*, really sympathizes with *Fedalma* when she throws her young Duke over so completely and suddenly, even in the sacred cause of nationality and filial duty. Nor, in *Ugone*, is it easy to follow the heroine in her transcendental abhorrence of a retribution which is not only in harmony with every principle of justice, but which, as narrated in the play, would be condoned in an ordinary English court of law. The last scene does indeed represent *Adelaide* on her death-bed; but it is made clear that, had she lived, *Ugone* would have forfeited their old connexion. Still, though the treatment throughout the latter

portions of the tragedy is so far at least unnatural and forced, yet the error is on the right side. The perfect balance of a perfectly beautiful nature has been very strikingly represented in this study of a genuine English girl. The shock to which she is subjected is too great to be recovered from before the vital powers have sunk under a final collapse; she is harassed to death by an unequal conflict with a passionate waywardness which she had nearly curbed, but which broke away beyond her power under the intolerable pressure of an evil destiny, and the active machinations of villainy.

There are some moments when the threads of life
So tangled are, no hand can set them loose;
And death cuts through the knot.

The studies of Francesco Bardi, the younger brother of Ugone, and of Marina Valdi, who ill-uses him and repents too late, are drawn with a great deal of effective care. Francesco is intended as the ideal of a highly intellectual nature, early and almost prematurely absorbed in a devotion to art. Like Ugone himself, he is permitted occasionally to rant in a manner which Mr. Armstrong will probably discard in any future composition. But his character is very distinctly conceived, and holds a definite and fitting place in the general caste.

On the whole, in spite of some weaknesses which have been, and of some others which might be, mentioned, we regard *Ugone* as a composition of really remarkable performance, and of genuine promise. It is a relief to come across a volume, undertaken by a young votary of imaginative literature, which consists of a completely worked out conception, and is not made up of one larger fragment giving its name to the book, and a good many smaller fragments called "other poems." A man does well and wisely to attempt a longer flight, and to put his capabilities to their best use if he comes before the public at all. We believe that Mr. Armstrong has it in his power to write a very much better drama than *Ugone*; but *Ugone* deserves all the praise due to an early study worked with energy and care and a great deal of real insight.

BREWER'S LETTERS AND PAPERS OF THE REIGN OF HENRY VIII.*

MR. BREWER'S fourth volume, which has been so long expected, will evidently be of much larger dimensions than either of the first three volumes of Letters and Papers upon which he has been now so usefully engaged for more than ten years. According to his advertisement it is intended to reach to the death of Wolsey, in November, 1530. But he has departed from his usual practice, and has issued the first part of his volume separately without either index or preface. This part alone, which reaches from January, 1524, to July, 1526, extends over more than one thousand pages, and contains probably more than three times that number of documents. The number, as estimated by Mr. Brewer, is 2,362, but he has in all cases of mere grants put them all together at the end of each month, and printed them in smaller type and in double columns, counting perhaps as many as thirty or forty under a single head—a practice which he has adopted since the publication of his first two volumes.

We must plead guilty to having experienced a little disappointment at seeing a volume without a preface, but we console ourselves with the thought that the documents are very fully analysed, and are many of them of first-rate interest and importance. First let us say one word about the sources of the work. A glance over its marginal references will suffice to show what this Calendar would have lost if Mr. Brewer had been confined, as other Calendarers are, to the State papers which are preserved in the Record Office. In almost every page, and sometimes for several consecutive pages with scarcely any intervening documents, the reference is given to the Cottonian Collection. With the exception of the grants and short official notices, a large proportion of the papers are taken from other sources than the Record Office. Mr. Brewer's immense acquaintance with books has enabled him to collect together probably nearly every letter of the period, referring to English affairs, that has yet been printed in English, French, German, or Italian collections.

There are two or three documents indeed, the loss of which we should have much regretted, and the insertion of which not only illustrates Mr. Brewer's extensive acquaintance with literature, but exhibits also in a most striking light the deficiencies of Government repositories of State papers. It is scarcely possible to imagine but that the King's letter to the Dukes of Saxony of January 20, 1524, must once have been, either as a finished letter or in draft, in our national Collection, but the analysis of it is given in the volume before us, from the Ep. Gothanæ and from Baronius. It is an extremely interesting account of Lutheranism as viewed by the King, who probably was looking through Wolsey's spectacles when he said that "No faction was ever so universally pernicious as this Lutheran conspiracy, which profanes sacred things, preaches Christ so as to trample on His sacraments, boasts of the grace of God so as to destroy free-will, extols faith so as to give license to sin, and places the inevitable cause of evils in the only good God?" The letter is chiefly remarkable as showing that even

at this early period the King had no objection to the Scriptures being translated into modern languages, though he strongly repudiated the particular version made by Luther. Whilst we are on this subject, we may observe that this volume contains a letter which settles the disputed question of the date of the first edition of Tyndale's New Testament. Lee, writing to Wolsey from Bordeaux, December 2, 1525, says that he "hears that an Englishman, at Luther's instigation, has translated the New Testament into English, and will bring printed copies into England in a few days." It has hitherto been doubtful whether there was any edition of earlier date than 1526, there being only two known copies of the first edition, both imperfect and without date. The answer of the Duke to the King, dated May 3, appears in print for the first time in this volume, from the mutilated volume Vitellius B. XXI. in the Cotton Collection, where it was wrongly catalogued as belonging to the year 1522.

Mr. Brewer has also bestowed infinite pains in deciphering, both in the literal and metaphorical sense of the word, the mutilated papers which have suffered from the fire which in 1731 damaged the Cotton Library so extensively. Several papers are supplied also from the Lansdowne and Harleian Collections, as also from the Additional Manuscripts in the British Museum. The Oxford and Cambridge Libraries, as well as the Archbishop's Collection at Lambeth, have contributed a few papers; and in addition to all the trouble involved in the hunt for original manuscripts, the editor has generally chronicled the fact, if fact it is, that the document analysed had previously found its way into print. Not only is this done as regards books that are commonly known, as Ellis's Letters, or the State papers of the reign published by Government, or Rymer's *Fœdera*, but scarcely any publication which contains any document of the period has been neglected; and though of course we cannot pretend to say that there may not be more similar omissions which we have not noticed, we were at first a little surprised to discover one such instance. No. 1,519 is a letter of Katharine of Aragon to the Princess Mary, which happens to have been printed at length by Miss Strickland in her life of that Queen; and even here it is not improbable that the reference was purposely omitted, as this lady does not profess to print original documents at length, and generally gives us only short extracts. But again we notice that Mr. Brewer has in no case described the papers that were printed in the Appendix to Galt's Life of Wolsey. This can scarcely have been an accident, and we are driven to the supposition that the editor has not thought it worth while to pay any attention to collections of documents such as are contained in this Appendix, unless they should happen to be expressed just as they are in the original MSS.; and it is well known that many of these letters are mere translations, and therefore not fit to be quoted as documentary evidence. Of course Mr. Brewer has an efficient staff of assistants both of the first and second class, or no such volumes as these could be produced. The very first letter printed in this volume well illustrates the difficulty of the task. It is a holograph letter from Anne Boleyn to her father, which exists in the Library at Corpus Christi College, Cambridge. It was first printed by Sir Henry Ellis in his Second Series of Letters illustrative of English History. The comparison of the two copies will show how easily even an accomplished scholar may fail to represent such a document with sufficient exactness. Not only has its first editor fallen into several mistakes in producing Anne Boleyn's words, but he has more than once apparently mistaken their meaning. Mr. Brewer has printed it line for line and word for word from the original, and has done his best to describe it in several notes which he has added. His insertion of it appears to have been an afterthought, for, as he himself observes, it belongs to an earlier period, whether the French Queen referred to in it be Mary, the sister of Henry VIII. of England, or her stepdaughter Claude, the wife of Francis I. of France. The letter is a curiosity and nothing more. It proves only that Anne Boleyn wrote a villanous hand, and that the miserably imperfect acquaintance with French which she possessed as a girl was derived from conversation and not from study.

As regards Anne Boleyn herself the present volume does not contain a vestige of information. The next instalment, when it comes out, will probably contain many documents which directly relate to her, but as the present volume only reaches to the end of July, 1526, and the earliest known hint about the divorce belongs to the spring of the following year, it is not likely that Warham's letter to Wolsey (1,044) refers to this subject. The letter implies some secret which Wolsey had entrusted to Warham, and as it is without date, we are almost inclined to think it belongs to the year 1527; but perhaps Mr. Brewer has grounds that we do not know of for assigning it to 1525, in which case it can hardly relate to the "great matter," though there is a suspicious reference in another letter from Warham to Wolsey, of April 12, 1525, which contains the words "till this great matter of the King's grace be ended." We have given the marginal date of this letter, the letter itself being dated, probably by misprint, April 19, as the contents of the letter show that it was written before Easter, which fell that year on the 16th of April. No work of this kind can be faultless, and Mr. Brewer may possibly discover that he has been sometimes in error in assigning the date of the year to papers scarcely any of which bear any other date than that of the month. Meanwhile he has corrected all the mistakes of this kind made in the valuable collection of State papers published by the Government in 1840.

At the period at which this volume commences Clement VII. had

* Letters and Papers, Foreign and Domestic, of the Reign of Henry VIII., preserved in the Public Record Office, the British Museum, and elsewhere in England. Arranged and Catalogued by J. S. Brewer, M.A., under the Direction of the Master of the Rolls, and with the Sanction of Her Majesty's Secretaries of State. Vol. IV. Part I. London: Longmans & Co. 1870.

just succeeded to the Papal throne. The conclave which elected him in succession to Adrian had sat from the 1st of October till November 19. Wolsey had seen and determined that the next Pope must be either himself or the Cardinal de' Medici, and he was informed from time to time of the disputes of the two factions by the ambassadors at Rome. He probably knew that his chance was small, and was anxious to appear on the side of De' Medici, who he thought would win. Accordingly, amongst the earliest documents of the volume will be found the Datary's letter of thanks on the Pope's behalf for Wolsey's services, and the information sent to him by the ambassadors that the new Pope had granted him the legateship for the term of his life.

Wolsey was at this time at the very highest point in Henry's favour, and in influence at the Courts of Europe. Our readers scarcely need to be informed that the circumstances of the year 1525 bear a remarkable resemblance to recent European events. The French King had been taken prisoner at the battle of Pavia; the young Emperor was under an engagement to marry the Princess Mary; Francis before the end of the year was a prisoner at Madrid, and Charles had suggested, as the condition on which he might be restored to liberty, the restoration of Burgundy, and the surrender of Dauphiné and Provence to be set up as a distinct sovereignty. The detention of the illustrious captive in Spain led to various surmises and plots as to the partition of the French kingdom, and Henry perhaps really entertained hopes of uniting France, or at least a considerable portion of it, to his kingdom, if Burgundy should be restored to the Imperial dominions. The volume contains three documents relating to this subject which are of unusual interest, one of which has appeared in print before, while the other two are now first brought to light from the stores of the Cotton Library. The first, which appeared for the first time in the sixth volume of the State papers of the reign, contains the instructions of the 26th March, 1525, given to the ambassadors sent to the Emperor; the second consists of the overtures made to Margaret of Savoy, and the answers to the same signed in the hand of the Archduchess; the third is dated June 2, and gives an account of the first and several other interviews which the ambassadors had with the Emperor. It is a joint letter, and is supplemented by three others written on the same day by the same persons to Wolsey. One of these is of the nature of a private letter from Tunstall, and contains a passage in cipher which probably shows that Tunstall was admitted into Wolsey's confidence to the exclusion of the other two ambassadors.

Wolsey probably had little confidence in the success of the extravagant proposals which the ambassadors were empowered to make. The suggestion was that Henry and Charles should meet at Paris—Henry to receive the crown of France, to which he alleged he had a just title both by inheritance and by treaty; he was then to assist Charles in recovering all the rights of the Empire, and the magnificent future was held out to him of the universal monarchy of Christendom, gaining—in addition to Spain, Germany, and the Low Countries, which he possessed by inheritance, and the Empire, which he held by election—through the Princess Mary, whom he was to marry, England, Ireland, the title to the superiority of Scotland, and all France and its dependencies.

But each party knew pretty well what the other was about. The Emperor had already resolved to marry "the daughter and sister of Portingale," and the joint letter addressed by Tunstall, Wingfield, and Sampson to Wolsey details some very angry words used by Charles animadverting on the Cardinal's conduct towards himself. It is amusing to read the concluding paragraphs of the two private letters written on the same day to Wolsey. Sir Richard Wingfield presumed to give the Cardinal his advice to keep on good terms with the Emperor, and to do some friendly act to remove the opinion Charles has conceived of him. Tunstall thinks it were best to give them good words for good words, keeping secret his thoughts as they do, and ends with the following passage in cipher:—

Whatever overtures Wolsey makes to the French Council, or the French Council to him, will be known here before they take effect, as the Regent keeps her eyes this way for the recovery of her son. The negotiations with Joachim are perfectly known here. Think the French ambassadors will bring all letters with them to try and separate the King and Emperor, but the Emperor affirms that he will never take any way with France until they agree with the King's demands. Wolsey must take heed hereunto.

We regret that Mr. Brewer has given the passage in *oratio obliqua*. We fancy that in previous volumes such passages have generally been copied *verbatim et literatim*, which we think should always be done with ciphered despatches.

Exactly a week after this letter was despatched comes the Commission signed by Louise of Savoy, as Regent of France, to treat for peace with Henry VIII.; and two days later we have intelligence of the King's consent to the Emperor's marriage with the Princess of Portugal, and negotiations for peace with France; and just a month later still, dated July 6, 1525, the King's Commission to Tunstall, Wingfield, and Sampson to rescind the Treaty of Windsor for the marriage of the Princess Mary to Charles V., and to treat for the repayment of the money due from the Emperor. Nor had many months elapsed before compliments were being exchanged and presents sent between the Courts of France and England. On the 22nd of May, 1526, Wolsey acknowledges a present to Henry of two mules sent in the French King's name by the Regent, "as fair, goodly, and well-trained beasts as hath been seen." He adds, "I have also received two no less to be praised than the others for beauty, goodness, train, and rich garnishing;

they might have been a right honourable present to have been sent unto the Pope's holiness." The ambassadors are instructed to return his own and the King's most cordial thanks in the largest manner that can be devised. The King will not fail to return their love by all the ways possible. "Where there shall lack sufficiency in me to report their singular goodness, I shall supply it with my prayer." On the same day Wolsey wrote a reply to Francis's autograph letter, and says he esteems and loves him next to the King his master. A week later Taylor writes to Wolsey that Francis had taken him after dinner to the window, "and with affectionate heart and joyous countenance told me that the President had brought him such tidings from his brother the King our master, and your Grace, that he seemed perfectly to know your kind hearts." And, upon replying to Wolsey's letter of thanks, the ambassador remarks that Madame had said the "mules were not half so much worth as your Grace had made thanks both by your present letters and also by messengers; but she was right glad they pleased the King's highness and your Grace, and she would daily study what things might be other to your Grace pleasant, or else to your ease, for because your Grace is occupied in so great business." Such were the relations of France and England at the end of the volume, just before Wolsey embarked on the perilous voyage in which his splendid projects for the aggrandizement of England, and retaining her in obedience to the Papal See, suffered such terrible shipwreck. If it had not been for Anne Boleyn he might have succeeded; but we must not anticipate the remaining parts of this volume, which will in all probability contain documents of even greater importance than those of the volume we have been reviewing, which gives no hint of coming failure. Indeed, we are inclined to wonder more and more at the work which was done almost singlehanded by Wolsey. The volume contains a few interesting documents relating to Ireland, and is full of papers referring to Scottish affairs, on which we must be entirely silent on this occasion. Not only are many of these letters, but also those from other parts of Europe, addressed to Wolsey. That is to say, after omitting to notice the Cardinal's replies and the State papers which must have been drawn up by him, but to which his name is not appended, there must be in this single part of Mr. Brewer's fourth volume nearly a thousand letters addressed directly to Wolsey. And not only was he engaged in every diplomatic transaction which affected the state of Europe, but at home also he was unceasingly employed in putting down heresy and suppressing monasteries. He was at once the greatest Churchman and the greatest Reformer of the day. Already Luther's books had made their way into England, and from the abjurations we meet with it is plain that there were many who were not content with stopping where Luther had stopped, but who had gone such lengths as to deny that any prayer should be used but the Pater Noster, and to assert that all prelates were Antichrists.

Wolsey had seen that the endowments of the monasteries must be turned to better account than hitherto, and we have in the present volume a catalogue of twenty such houses that were dissolved in a single month, with a view to the promotion of learning by the foundation of two great Colleges at Oxford and Ipswich. The latter never really existed. The former has survived, though the credit of it is commonly given to the King's munificence, instead of where it is really due, to the Cardinal's sagacity. And now we part for a time with Mr. Brewer, promising ourselves a rich treat when the remaining parts of the volume are published, together with the preface, which the editor announces as about to appear "along with the last part."

CUMBERLAND AND WESTMORELAND M.P.'S.

PARLIAMENTARY history has hitherto been written too exclusively with reference to debates and divisions and other incidents within the walls of the two Houses. This is only one side of the picture; to complete it, it is necessary to turn the subject round and look at it from the other end—to observe the conditions under which different Parliaments are elected, the relations between members and constituencies, and the personal and political influences and other springs of action which are locally at work during the process of election. This is the point of view which Mr. Ferguson has chosen. He has undertaken to illustrate our Parliamentary history from the Restoration to the present day by an examination of the elections in Cumberland and Westmoreland during that period. He has been at a great deal of pains in collecting his materials; but, when collected, they appear to have proved rather too much for him. He has evidently no faculty for arrangement, no eye for proportion and perspective. Having got together a large mass of historical and biographical details, Mr. Ferguson has broken down in a futile effort to put them into shape, and has at last been obliged to leave his heap, or rather heaps, of facts for the reader to make the best of. We cannot honestly say that the book is an interesting book, but it contains a good deal of interesting matter for anybody who will take the trouble to sift it out. Of course a good deal of the ground over which Mr. Ferguson carries us is familiar enough, but the local aspects of important passages in our national history have a value of their own.

* *Cumberland and Westmoreland M.P.'s from the Restoration to the Reform Bill of 1867 (1660-1867)*. By Richard S. Ferguson, M.A. London: Bell & Daldy. Carlisle: Thurnham & Sons.

The strong Royalist sympathies of Cumberland and Westmoreland had been rather intensified than weakened by their sufferings under the Commonwealth, when they had to endure not only the exactions of the civil authorities, but the military tyranny of Sir James Turner, the original of Dugald Dalgetty, whose Scottish troops had, alternately with the Parliamentary army, occupied the two counties. During this period the members sent up to Parliament were for the most part officers in Cromwell's service, who had speculated largely in forfeited lands. In the Convention nearly all the Parliamentary men disappeared and enthusiastic Royalists were returned. Charles Howard and Sir Wilfrid Lawson, who came in for Cumberland, had been adherents of Cromwell, but were now favourable to the Restoration. The general election of 1661, in which it is evident the Government actively interfered, deepened still further the Royalist complexion of the House of Commons. It was at this time that the Countess of Pembroke wrote her famous letter in answer to an application by Secretary Williamson to support a Government candidate for Appleby:—"I have been bullied by a usurper, neglected by a Court, but I will not be dictated to by a subject. Your man shan't stand.—Anne Dorset and Pembroke." The Cavaliers, having got the upper hand, made the most of their position. Sir Philip Musgrave, having been appointed Governor of Carlisle, came down, in his own words, as "State physician, to purge the Corporations of Carlisle, Kendal, and Appleby." The Nonconformists were persecuted with relentless severity. A "Quaker's letter" is found on the road, near Cockermouth, couched in somewhat mysterious language. The magistrates hastily assemble, and all the leading Quakers are seized and despatched to Carlisle Sessions, where a batch of sixty of them are straightway convicted under the new penal laws. A Quaker, Thomas Sturdy, of Monkhouse, "born to the inheritance of a handsome estate," happens to be at Carlisle during the Assizes, visits some friends in prison, and is himself detained by the gaoler. The next day, refusing to take the oath of allegiance when tendered to him, he is again locked up, and on the morrow has a sentence of imprisonment, involving forfeiture of all his property, real and personal, passed upon him. He was confined in prison for nine years, and on his release recovered his estate through the intercession of the Earl of Carlisle, but was again thrown into gaol, where he died a year or two afterwards, for absenting himself from public worship. This treatment, it may be imagined, had by no means a soothing effect on the persons subjected to it. "The Quakers," Sir P. Musgrave wrote to the Government, "grow bold enough to meet two hundred or more at a time. They keep copies of proceedings against them by Justices of the Peace, to be ready against a time when they shall call the Justices to account." A rising in the North, led by Captain Atkinson, one of Cromwell's old dragoons, might have proved formidable if it had not been nipped in the bud.

A few years later we find the magistrates, still hot in persecuting Quakers, pursuing the Catholics with equal keenness. The proceedings of the Court had excited a suspicion that the Protestantism of the country was in danger, and even the Pensioners' Parliament, as it was called, after eighteen years of well-paid subservience, proved intractable, and had to be hurriedly dissolved to prevent an open breach with the Crown. In the elections of 1679 Cumberland and Westmoreland were content to return, for the most part, their former members. The King endeavoured to secure a more complaisant House of Commons by striking directly at its origin—attacking the charters of Whig boroughs in the Queen's Bench, and compelling their surrender for new ones, under which the Crown had the nomination of most of the members of the Corporations. Carlisle suffered thus at the hands of Judge Jeffreys, and the old charter of Appleby was also confiscated. Although James II.'s first and only Parliament gave him an overwhelming majority—so much so that, as he said, it was, with the exception of some forty members, just such as he would himself have nominated—he soon exhausted its patience, and dissolved it, with the intention of packing a new one by every means in his power. The borough charters were again manipulated. The Lords-Lieutenant were ordered off to their counties to ascertain, or, in other words, influence, opinion in the interest of the Government. Those who declined such work—among them the Earl of Thanet, Lord-Lieutenant of Cumberland and Westmoreland—were at once dismissed. His Majesty, however, soon discovered that he had been pushing matters too far, reinstated the dismissed Lords-Lieutenant, and restored the charters, but too late to save himself. It is significant that in two such warmly Jacobite counties as Cumberland and Westmoreland the supporters of the Revolution were triumphant in the elections for the Convention of 1688. Their ready assent to the new Government was, however, mainly due to the influence of the Lowthers and other local families. There was no attachment to King William himself, and the Whigs had to fight hard to maintain their ground. The contests of the Lowthers and Musgraves in Parliament were renewed at the elections, and on Queen Anne's accession the Tory reaction carried seven of the ten local seats. Gradually, however, the politics of the two houses assimilated, for though the Musgraves continued to be Tories, and the Lowthers Whigs, the latter were Whigs of the Country party, and in opposition, which came practically to much the same thing as if they had been Tories. Sir James Lowther's marriage to a daughter of Lord Bute in 1761 confirmed his Toryism, but he still retained his independence, opposing Lord North vigorously; and though usually staunch to Pitt, ordering all "his people" to vote against him on the Regency, in order to oblige the Prince of Wales. This

Sir James was the "little tyrant of the North" of Junius, and the first Earl of Lonsdale. By the death of cousins and other relatives he succeeded to the honours (with the exception of a lapsed peerage) and estates of three branches of the Lowther family, thus concentrating in himself enormous wealth and political authority. The representation of the two counties and three local boroughs—Carlisle, Cockermouth, and Appleby—was pretty much at his disposal. He could always return the two members for Westmoreland, one for Cumberland, one for Appleby, two for Cockermouth, one for Carlisle, and two for his borough of Haslemere in the South. The Parliamentary votes which were thus at his command were known in the slang of the day as the Lowther ninepins, or cat-o'-nine-tails. He also carried the electoral war beyond the limits of his direct territorial influence, and if he lost a seat at Carlisle, could usually make up for it by a victory at Wigan, Lancaster, or Durham. His plan was to put up himself and his more immediate friends each for two constituencies, so that they might be certain of a seat in any case. If they won both, the safest of the surplus seats were distributed among his other nominees. It was thus that, in 1780, he had a vacant seat at Appleby which he was able to offer to William Pitt, then scarcely twenty-one, who was recommended to him by the Duke of Portland. "Judging from my father's principles," wrote Pitt to his mother, "he concludes that mine would be agreeable to his own, and on that ground, to me of all others the most agreeable, to bring me in. No kind of condition was mentioned, but that if ever our lines of conduct should be opposite, I should give him an opportunity of choosing another person."

For many years a large proportion of the members for the Cumberland and Westmoreland districts might have addressed each other as "cousins," if not by a nearer title of relationship. The same names and families are continually turning up in the Parliamentary lists. Between 1660 and 1867 twenty-one Lowthers sat in Parliament for different constituencies in Westmoreland and Cumberland, besides finding seats for a long "tail" of relatives and political supporters. The late Colonel H. C. Lowther, who died in 1867, had been in Parliament since 1812. He must have known Colonel James Lowther, who sat from 1775 to 1818, and the two thus made out between them ninety-two years of uninterrupted Parliamentary experience. Colonel H. C. Lowther was also as a boy presumably acquainted with Sir James, the first Earl, whose Parliamentary career commenced in 1757, and who in turn must have known Sir James Lowther of Whitehaven, whose heir he was, and whose Parliamentary experience extended from 1692 to 1754. Ten Musgraves have between 1660 and 1867 occupied local seats. Five Lawsons and four Curwens also appear in the list. A Sir Wilfrid Lawson represented Cumberland in the Convention Parliament of 1660, and another of the same name now represents the capital of the county. From the first the Lawsons are marked as independent and eccentric men. Sir Wilfrid (member for Cockermouth 1690-95) once went to the House of Commons dressed as a Cumberland labourer, with a loaf of coarse bread under one arm, and a skim-milk cheese under the other, to illustrate the inability of the agricultural classes to bear increased taxation. In 1717, when the King sent a message to the House of Commons asking for a supply to secure foreign alliances in order to checkmate the designs of Sweden, but without submitting any particulars, there was a good deal of opposition, and Secretary Stanhope declared that those who would not vote the supply were not the King's friends. This brought up Gilfrid Lawson, who declared that "if every member that used freedom of speech on any subject of debate must be accounted an enemy to the King when he happened not to fall in with his Ministers, he knew no service they were capable of doing for their country in the House, and therefore it was his opinion that they had nothing else to do but to retire to their country seats, and leave the King and his Ministers to take what they pleased." It may be remarked that a Sir Wilfrid Lawson was once Groom of the Bedchamber to George I.; but his opposition to Walpole in regard to the Spanish depredations proved that life at Court had not tainted the family spirit. We find also Howards, Flemings, Fletchers, Grahams, Tuftons, and Aglionbys repeatedly recurring in the representation of these northern constituencies. The Bentincks and Wyndhams do not appear in the Parliamentary list till comparatively close upon our own time. Of the strangers who have sat for places in this region Pitt is undoubtedly the most distinguished. Sir Philip Francis sat for several years for Appleby, which at one time also returned Bubb Dodington; but he chose another seat.

The political authority of the great landowners was sufficient to sway the elections in their own pocket boroughs and in the counties. But Carlisle had to be "managed," and apparently at a good deal of expense. The accounts of the Carlisle election in 1754 show that one side, at least, spent 900*l.*; so that if the other side spent anything like as much, the electors, considering their limited numbers, must have found the transaction a profitable one. One of the canvassers gave 84*l.* odd for punch, beef pies, and tobacco. Another put down 90*l.* for making free-men (who always expected to have their fees paid for them by the party for whom they undertook to vote), and pocketed as much for his trouble. In the same year there was a severe struggle at Appleby between the Lowthers and Tuftons, when a great deal of money was spent on each side in buying up houses and votes. The fight resulted in a compromise which lasted till 1832. In 1768, it was said, the Duke of Portland and Sir James Lowther spent 80,000*l.* or 100,000*l.* between them at an election for Cumberland. During the preliminaries of this election as much as

1,000*l.* often went in a single night's festivities. In 1796 the poll was open for nineteen days, and Mr. Ferguson calculates the total expenditure at 30,000*l.* When Lord Lonsdale died a few years afterwards, on the eve of another general election, a vast sum in gold was found in his private room, which was supposed to have been got together for the elections. It is somewhat startling nowadays to find that Henry Brougham, who thrice contested Westmoreland, on one occasion acknowledged from the hustings that "the great possessions of the Earl of Lonsdale gave him a claim on the two Northern counties to nominate one member for each." There can be no doubt that for a long period the electoral contests presented very much the appearance of personal rivalries between particular families; but this was to a certain extent because these families led the parties, and were identified with them in the popular mind. It is somewhat curious that Blue and Yellow should indicate respectively Whigs and Tories in Cumberland and Westmoreland, while across the Duddon, in North Lancashire, the symbols are reversed. Mr. Ferguson's explanation of the Cumbrian colours is that they were taken from the arms of the Lowthers and the Bentincks.

DURNTON ABBEY.*

SIR WALTER SCOTT, in *The Heart of Midlothian*, has set an example which it would be well if novelists were to follow. Though the main plot of his story rests on a case of seduction, yet he brings very little before the reader of Gentleman Geordie, the author of Effie's ruin, but dwells almost entirely on the unfortunate girl and her family. He was not the writer to attempt to interest his reader by the history of a selfish profligate, nor even, though he kills him off in the end, does he think that any good reason for writing at length his life. Neither, indeed, is his story chiefly concerned with Effie herself, or her sin and sufferings. Undoubtedly at one period of the story the whole interest turns on the awful doom which is awaiting her, but even then it is not of her that we are told so much, but of her father who is bowed down by her shame, and of her sister who to save her will dare and do anything but lie. He rightly spares the reader the vulgarity of the guilt of the man, and though in the trial scene he shows all the piteousness of the guilt of the woman, yet he soon turns away to the deep love of Jeanie, who, as so often happens, though innocent, had to bear as heavy a burden as the guilty.

It is owing to this that *The Heart of Midlothian*, though a tale of seduction, is yet of all tales the purest. There is, as there will be, sin, and with sin shame and suffering. But it is neither the sin, nor even the shame and suffering, that are brought so much into the light as the honest and loving strivings of the innocent to heal the sin, to hide the shame, and to soothe the suffering. Let any one who has not read this noble story for some years turn back his thoughts to it, and he will find that in his memory there dwells not a tale of woman's frailty, but of woman's fortitude. He will find in all probability that he has forgotten the very name of the profligate, for Scott was not a man who needed to dwell long on men like George Staunton in order to win his reader's interest. He will have no scenes to dwell upon in his memory where woman's innocence was turned into weakness, and where weakness was turned into shame. Compare such a story as this with *Adam Bede*, for instance, where poor Hetty's fall is slowly traced, and where in the memory there certainly remain fixed the meetings in the old summer-house between her and her lover. Undoubtedly in *Adam Bede* are also finely set forth the love and the patience of one who, though greatly wronged, was not unforgiving to her who had wronged him. But *Adam Bede* is as certainly a story of woman's shame as *The Heart of Midlothian* is of her strength. We could have wished that Mr. Adolphus Trollope, when in *Durnton Abbey* he had chosen a somewhat similar plot, had followed rather the earlier than the later novelist's example. Perhaps he has not dwelt quite so much even as the author of *Adam Bede* on the woman's fall; but he has more than made up for this by the prominence which he has given to the seducer. It is curious to notice still further the comparative importance of the male characters in these three stories. In *The Heart of Midlothian*, while George Staunton is but of the smallest importance, Mr. Butler is not of very much more. In *Adam Bede* Arthur Donnithorne holds a considerable place, while Adam himself holds almost the first. In *Durnton Abbey* Reginald Varley is really the hero, while the nominal hero, Brian Betterton, who marries the sister, is somewhat insignificant. Scott has chiefly shown, when a woman is seduced, how strong can be her sister's love; the author of *Adam Bede*, while dwelling more on the seducer, has shown how strong can be the injured lover's devotion; while Mr. Adolphus Trollope, while not passing over the sister's devotion, has shown how vulgar and how vile can be the seducer. It is this prominence given to coarse vice which, in spite of many scenes of considerable humour and not a little pathos, left in our mind after we had reached the end of *Durnton Abbey* a most unpleasant recollection. It was but a slight satisfaction that Reginald met that fate which, as Fielding tells us, alone renders perfect a hero's career, and was hanged. If he had been hanged at the

end of the first volume we might have endured him; but a heartless fop of a country town who can do nothing well except waltz, and even when he commits a murder bungles over it, is not to be borne with till the last chapter. Mr. Adolphus Trollope might perhaps object that, however offensive Reginald may be, he is nevertheless a natural character. This we are not prepared to deny, for country towns too often possess young men who, by the servility of their imitation of the profligate of the capital, are able to add one more to a list of vices which at first sight seems complete. Indeed we know of no more hateful thing in nature than the fast man of a country town, who has now and then run up to London to see life, as he calls it, and has returned home to display to his small knot of admirers his familiarity with the great world. So hateful and contemptible a thing is it that we would willingly have nothing to do with it. There are indeed enthusiastic naturalists who tell us that to the cultivated mind the study of the organism of the blackbeetle, under intelligent teaching, raises the deepest feelings of reverence. For ourselves, we must confess that the pure artistic feeling is not sufficiently developed for us to be able to forget, in the ingenuity of the organism, the loathsomeness of either the blackbeetle or of Mr. Reginald Varley.

Bad as is this provincial hero, still worse, when her sex is considered, is Miss Lillian Lagarde of Durnton Abbey. Perhaps Mr. Trollope may have remembered the old saying, "that every John has his Joan," and may have thought that fidelity to nature required that he should turn out a heroine not unworthy of his hero. In this he has certainly succeeded, and he can boast of having produced the two meanest and most worthless characters that it has ever been our ill fortune to have come across. It would have been some small atonement, some sacrifice to decency, if he had hanged this baronet's daughter in company with Reginald Varley, the banker's nephew. Perhaps, however, the common hangman would have refused the task with disgust, and would have maintained that even a hangman has his feelings of self-respect. This young lady, with her "delicate pale cheeks and the goddess-like dark brow," who smoked and drank in secret, and was one of those who "are driven by some subtle fitness of things to the use of that language which, in every age and clime, has been the constantly used vehicle of moral corruption," finding that she had not money enough to buy herself a dress for the Duke of Askridge's fancy ball, set about wheedling Reginald into robbing his uncle's bank. This miserable wretch had just completed poor Maud's ruin, and was easily led away from the simple country girl to the artificial woman of fashion, who was as corrupt as he was himself. As if the company were not bad enough already, Mr. Harrington Ormerod is introduced, who easily passes himself off on Reginald as a man of fashion, but who turns out to be Robert Irby, *alias* Jaunty Jemmy, a gentleman well known to the London detective police. He becomes, indeed, so intimate with Reginald as to get wind of the exposure which threatens him whenever his books at the bank are balanced. Having this hold over him, he reveals his true character, and, dropping the mask of a man of fashion, induces Reginald to join with him in a scheme for breaking into the bank. Reginald, however, when driven into turning burglar, prefers as the safer scheme of the two to rob Maud's old uncle, a wealthy tradesman of Durnton. He proves to be but a bungling housebreaker, and dropping a steel tool, rouses the old man, who at once recognises him, but only to meet his death at the profligate's hand. By a most extraordinary coincidence, poor Maud, who had been in hiding for months, had that same night been secretly let into her uncle's house to see her baby, who was then being brought up by her sister. Nay, moreover, through carelessness in closing the back-door by which she had come in, she and her sister had afforded an easy entrance to the robbers. She recognises her false lover's face, but will not betray him. His guilt is brought home to him by the dagger which he had used, and which had been given him by Miss Lillian Lagarde; but believing that it was Maud who had betrayed him, he speaks to her so bitterly that she falls down dead in the police court "slain by a viprous breath." Reginald Varley, repulsive as he is, is nevertheless, as we have before said, for all we know, a natural enough character. Miss Lillian Lagarde, however, while she is equally repulsive, is altogether unnatural, and though we cannot pretend to any minute acquaintance with convicts, we do not hesitate to pronounce Mr. Harrington Ormerod almost as unnatural.

Happily there is quite another side to *Durnton Abbey*, and in all those chapters where these three monsters of wickedness are absent there is much that we can praise. Perhaps Darby Borlace, Maud's father, is not altogether an original character, but at all events this rough, hearty farmer is well drawn. He is troubled, as all men in novels are whose daughters get into trouble, with a pious sister-in-law, who is always ready to take advantage of another's sufferings to improve the occasion. The following extract will not unfairly illustrate the better side of *Durnton Abbey*, and will at the same time give a slight insight into the character of the farmer and his dissenting and serious brother and sister-in-law:—

"Ah, if she would come to me—if she would come to me! If my little one would but come back to me!" said the unhappy old man, throwing back his grey head, as he sat in his great chair, and lifting his streaming eyes to the rafters above him, while he threw open his arms wide, as yearning to clasp the lost one to his heart.

"If she would come," continued Silas, "and say, 'Father, I have sinned

* *Durnton Abbey*. A Novel. By Thomas Adolphus Trollope, Author of "La Beata," "The Garstangs," &c. 3 vols. London: Bentley & Son. 1871.

against heaven, and before Thee, and am no more worthy to be called Thy child!"

"If she would come, and say nought at all; but just lay her pretty head on my shoulder!" said the old man, fairly breaking into sobs, that seemed to be bursting his great broad chest asunder. "Oh, if she would, if she would. I'd like to see the man as would go for to say a word again her—or the woman either! Damn me, I should! damn me, I should!" he added, looking fiercely round, and striving to cover the womanly tenderness of his emotions by the manifestation of a fictitious indignation.

"Brother Darby! brother Darby! is that the way to speak when the finger of the Lord is heavy upon you! I wonder you don't expect the roof to come down upon our head!" said Mrs. Silas.

"It me't come down for me! I'm sick and tired o' this life, and ready to ha' done with it for my part!" said the farmer.

We notice, by the way, that the farmer's dialect is scarcely that of a North-countryman. It is not, of course, to be expected that a novelist should only lay the scene of his stories in a district with the language of which he is thoroughly familiar. Nor do we see any very good reason why there should not be a conventional talk, which should in the same way be allowed to be suggestive of the country as in London the curious garb of the milkman is supposed to be suggestive of milk. Perhaps, however, it would save authors and readers not a little trouble if some peculiar form of type were invented, in which the story should be printed whenever a rustic is on the stage. An enterprising publisher might even embellish such pages with initial letters in the shape of a huge turnip or a mangold-wurzel. With such assistance from typography Mr. Adolphus Trollope's characters might seem much more than they do at present to babble of green fields.

Mrs. Silas perhaps reminds us a little too much of Aunt Pallet in the *Mill on the Floss*, but nevertheless she is very entertaining, and is a most agreeable and frequent relief to the dullness of the wicked characters. She fancies herself a great invalid, and indeed from this fact was the more easily induced to receive into her household poor Maud's baby:—

For manage it [she said] as I will—and, God knows, Silas, I am as careful over it as possibly can be—there's sure to be ends of bottles and such-like; or, may be, a powder now and then running to waste! And it'll all come in for the child! It always goes to my heart to see good medicine wasted.

While in all other respects she was a dutiful wife, and readily yielded obedience to her husband, on medicine questions she stood firm, for "it stood to reason, she said, that she must know best what was going on in her own inside." Silas, too, is a well-drawn character; and surely if the plot of the story absolutely required that Reginald should be hanged, some one else might have been found to be murdered than the simple old mercer of the High Street of Durnton. There is so much that is good in Mr. Adolphus Trollope's story, that we cannot but feel how easily it might have been better. We hope that he will before long put forth his undoubted power in another story of life in a country town, and that he will allow his characters to be a little more observant of the obligations of the moral law.

MR. SEWARD IN MEXICO.*

THROUGHOUT the whole Western Continent the name of Mr. W. H. Seward stands as the type and representative of a diplomatic triumph second hardly to that which is connected with one well-known name of almost magical transcendence in Europe. If to any man in particular is due the suppression of Imperialist designs and Old World meddling in the West, Mr. Seward is the man. In Mexico especially, set free by his hand and brain from French domination and intrigue, is he the god of popular idolatry, and Colonel Albert S. Evans is his prophet. The tour of the late Minister for Foreign Affairs through the Sister Republic, if less gorgeous in its external array, or in the pomp and pretence of its surroundings, had not a little of the excitement, and possibly of the influence, of a royal progress in olden times. Albeit travelling in the simple and unadorned republican style in which we see him in the first of Colonel Albert Evans's woodcuts, clad in the inevitable surcoat and pants, cigar in mouth, sitting in an armchair screened by curtains from the sun, borne litter-fashion by a couple of mules, no more glowing or doubtless heartfelt greetings could attend a royal monarch from the moment that the anchor dropped from the bows of U.S. steamship *Golden City*, a week after leaving San Francisco, September 30, 1869, in the harbour of Manzanillo. The Governor and his friends, "all dressed in European costume," though ignorant of the language of their visitors, met them at the Custom House, anticipated every want, and proffered unbounded hospitality. Perpetual rain somewhat marred the enjoyment of a place which, bating such casual torrents, besides fever, ague, and the sharks, needs but ten years of peace to form one of the most important seaports of the Western Main. When it does clear up for a minute, nothing can well exceed the beauty and enjoyableness of the scenery and climate. Though the natives, poorly clad and fed, were seen lying in heaps under the verandah apparently half dead with fever, the Europeans and Americans suffer but little. Though the bay swarms with sharks, and the inland lake with alligators, one plague may be paired off against the other. This actually was the case, our travellers learnt, two years before. A sudden freshet drove the alligators out of the lake into the bay,

and a fight, long, bloody, and terrible to witness, took place between them and the sharks. The inhabitants saw with perfect indifference the alligators "cleared out bag and baggage" by the sharks. "It was none of their funeral anyhow." As our party rowed up the lake the alligators showed themselves very cautious and shy, seldom giving a chance for a pistol-shot. Never were finer rowers seen than the five of pure Indian blood who, nearly, if not entirely, naked, pulled the canoes. Had they been selected instead of the Harvards to row against the Oxfords, Colonel Evans would have staked his money, if he had any to risk, on the American side. Crossing the Rio Santa Maria in their frail little craft seemed like certain death; but our author, "bounding up and down like an indiarubber ball," got over first in safety, followed by the great man, to receive the inevitable after-dinner oration on the greatness of the States and the common interests of the Sister Republics. At Colima "the Beautiful" they were received sumptuously at the palatial mansion of Señor Huarte, a native of old Spain, who did the honours in princely style. The sketch of his grand house, with its columns and arcades, reminds us of the Doge's palace at Venice. The ball and banquet at the Governor's house, a building in the Moorish style, with glass roof, over-spreading palms, and coloured lamps, formed a fairy scene. Mr. Seward exclaimed, "It is a tropical forest, with Oriental illumination." Art vied with nature in honour of the occasion. At one end of the hall Don Benito Juarez, Salvador de la Patria, looked down in grim silence from the canvas. At the other end, a handsome portrait of Mr. Seward, "painted within two days by a native artist, was entwined with laurel and the flags of the two Republics. Better taste was never exhibited in any ball-room in America." Patriotic as our author is, he is compelled to acknowledge, on more than one occasion, the transcendent beauty of the belles of Mexico. After Mr. Seward's speech in reply to Governor Cuervo and other notables, a grand fandango was given at four P.M., not unlike the can-can, our author thought—curious, but not recommended by him for adoption by the sons and daughters of his native land. Inspection of the cotton products, schools, and goals, with a review of cavalry, diversified the pleasures of the stay in Colima, the "beloved of the sun."

At Guadalajara similar honours poured thick upon our travellers. A certificate of membership in the Academy of Science was awarded to the "defender of the liberties of all the Americas." At the Opera special performances were announced in his honour. It does not appear that the bull-fight, which was duly visited and denounced, was equally special. The usual speeches and roaring of the "Star-spangled Banner" followed in course. A week was taken up with seeing the magnificent cathedral, the schools and orphanages, which seem admirably managed, and worthy of the "strange, ancient, aristocratic, and haughty city." Here is a principal seat of the manufacture of those tasteful, lifelike statuettes in clay or wax which have been made familiar to us by the International Exhibitions of London and Paris. Here are on sale statuettes of every noted man in the country and in the world, from an inch to two feet high, elaborately worked and coloured, and many of them handsomely gilded. "They will make you a statuette, a perfect facsimile of yourself in miniature, on two days' notice." Another less agreeable characteristic is the mode of interment in the great cemetery of Bethlem, where the corpses are deposited in cells or niches cemented up, at the cost of twenty-five dollars for five years, paid in advance. "If at the end of that time another twenty-five dollars is not forthcoming, the place is again for rent." What becomes of the ejected tenant we fail to hear. The practice of brigandage at Guadalajara is carried on in the style of Thuggee in India, and even involves no loss of social repute or caste:—

I was one day conversing with a gentleman of high standing in Guadalajara, who had been carried off from the immediate vicinity of the city, and only released upon the payment of five thousand dollars, in coin. I asked him if he could not identify the men who kidnapped him, and received a ransom. "I know every one of them!" was the reply. "Then why do you not prosecute them and have them shot?" I asked. "I will tell you why: Every member of the gang has friends who would be appalled at one of the facts, and instructed to avenge their deaths in case I lived until the trial was ended. Governor Cuervo and his subordinates would do their duty without fear or favour, and the men would be shot; but I should be assassinated within a week thereafter, or possibly kidnapped again and carried off, to be tortured with every atrocity which Apaches are capable of, and die a lingering death; even my family would be persecuted, and perhaps meet a fate as terrible as my own."

"But are the leaders of the band so highly connected as I have been told?" I asked.

"You may be your own judge in that matter. I saw you introduced to one of them yesterday, and holding a long conversation with him!"

"But you did not put me on my guard," I said.

"Not I; I have even visited at his house and dined with his family since my release, and his daughter is a warm friend of my own. That man received the money from my brother, and he knows that I know him to be the regular financial agent and broker for the band!" It is hardly possible for a stranger to understand how such a state of affairs can exist without the direct connivance of the authorities; but it does so exist, nevertheless; and the rigour with which Gov. Cuervo and his associates execute the laws leaves no room for doubting that they are in earnest in the work.

Embroidery in linen and cotton, and the manufacture of paper, form the staple industry of the city. The excellence of the cookery struck our visitors, notwithstanding that the Mexicans have only earthen ovens and stoves, not a single iron dish being seen among them. In the light brown glazed earthenware of the country they contrive to turn out twenty times as great a variety of dishes as are to be seen in the States, and cooked, too, to perfection. The most odious production of the country is the native

* *Our Sister Republic: a Gala Trip through Tropical Mexico in 1869-70.* By Col. Albert S. Evans. With numerous Engravings. Hartford, Conn.: Columbia Book Company. London: Trübner & Co. 1871.

spirit, a villainous kind of rum, called *Aguariente del Cane*, "which is as much like boiled lightning as can be imagined, and the very smell of which will cause a very fair sample of the Christian gentleman to commit murder." Another horrible liquid distilled from the *Mescal*, or American aloe, otherwise known as the century plant, is sold for six and a fourth cents a bottle at the roadside, and will produce as much drunkenness as a barrel of North American whisky. A superior sort of *mescal*, called *Tequila*, after the village where it is produced, was tasted by our author by mistake for anisette. His head began to grow rapidly in the fashion he has pictured for us in the woodcut of a "swell-head," till his hat seemed in size like an umbrella, to be tilted up in going through the door, and his whole person, his legs decreasing in size, resembled a sugar hoghead walking off on two straws.

The speciality at Lagos is the mummy of its saint, whose name Colonel Evans forgets, a Roman soldier found by miracle at Rome, A.D. 901, preserved as if he were just dead. As a special favour to Mr. Seward the magnificent casket of glass was laid open to view. Our author's inference from the spectacle is that the Roman soldiers, if this was a fair specimen, were from about four feet eight or nine inches in height to five feet, allowing a fair margin for shrinkage; that they had no beard; that their faces were as delicate as those of a girl; that they had wax teeth, fingers, and toenails, and cuticle on hands, face, and shins, and wore gilt pasteboard tunics and coats of mail, silk stockings, and fancy booties; and he would "back the National Guard, Captain Ben Pratt of San Francisco, or the MacMahon Guard, General Canneau of the same place, to give odds to knock the starch out of the entire phalanx."

The facts and figures accumulated by Colonel Evans during the progress of his route go far towards bearing out his flattering picture of Mexico under her present system of government, and his glowing vaticinations of a golden future. Guanajato, in particular, impressed them with the idea of permanent prosperity, based upon natural resources and civil order, notwithstanding the falling off in the yield of the precious metals, and consequent thinning of the population. Education, works of sanitary importance, excellent roads, the best Mint in the Republic, worked by steam machinery of English make, bespeak the enlightened rule of the Governor-General Florencia Antillon, a distinguished soldier in the War of Independence, and stern exterminator of the "road agents," as the gentlemen of the highway are euphemistically termed. The reduction works, or beneficiating haciendas of Guanajato and Marfil, are worthy of special attention. Though somewhat old-fashioned and wasteful, the crushing machinery or *tortas* of Mr. Parkman, an American, working here on a large scale, may be regarded as a great success. The great mine of San José de Valenciana, which Mr. Seward was not able to see, was visited and is graphically described by our author. Its produce is said to have been, from first to last, eight hundred millions of dollars. In Humboldt's time it was estimated to yield one-fifth of all the silver in the world. The works aboveground cover acres upon acres, and the drifts and chambers below the surface, some now filled with water, measure miles in extent. At the main shaft the works, without parallel in America, resemble a vast fortress. Our party looked down the yawning chasm of the main shaft, or *tiro general*, and dropped stones down its depth into the dark pool 687 varas down—say, 1,939 feet. Two million dollars, it was thought, were required to drain the mine and replace it in full working order. The process of *plagiating* or kidnapping with a view to ransom, the bane of the district, is unfairly, our author believes, charged upon a body of Italians, two hundred in number, imported into Mexico to teach the culture and manufacture of silk. It is being put down with vigour by the Juárez Administration, shooting being the universal penalty. The bands are made up, he considers, of the mercenary scum of many European nations brought over in the train of Maximilian. A grand effect was witnessed by our author and those of like nerve with him, through witnessing half-way down the 1,000 feet shaft of the Terrano mine an illumination and burst of fireworks, got up in their honour. A woodcut gives a vivid but painful idea of the wretched Indian miner, a "human tarantula," whose lifelong task it is, in groups of hundreds, naked and sweltering, utterly in the dark save for the lamp on his forehead, to carry water in a pigskin up to the reservoir, in aid of the pumps which feebly keep under the flow in the mine. The name of Queretaro naturally suggests the melancholy story of the extinction of the ill-starred Empire in the blood of the hapless Maximilian. The details were carefully verified and gone over by Mr. Seward on the spot, and reported by Colonel Evans, who apologizes for want of sympathy with the men who expiated their crimes against liberty and the rights of men at the Cerro de las Campanas. He would have doubted the justice of God had Maximilian lived and the thousands of brave men who were sent to death slept unavenged in their bloody graves. Never did the mills of the gods, grinding slowly and grinding small, grind, he thinks, a finer grist than that which Napoleon III. sent to their mill, marked "Empire of Mexico."

The crowning point of the progress was reached when at the capital, November 24, Mr. Seward and party received the official salutations of President Juárez in the grand saloon in which took place the Feast of Belshazzar on the eve of Maximilian's fatal setting out for Queretaro. Inexpressibly lovely, as our author pictures it, is the palace of Chapultepec, on which had been lavished every resource of nature and art to fit it for the seat of an

Imperial dynasty. In the gardens still bloomed the flowers which Carlotta—our author never heard her called poor Carlotta in Mexico—had planted. The last order found signed by the Imperial hand was one for 2,000 German nightingales to stock the groves of Chapultepec. What to republican severity seemed the "obscene statuary," though mutilated in no delicate manner, still adorned the gardens. The magnificent colonnade along the whole front of the palace next to Tacubaya, stands unfinished, a symbol of blighted aims and hopes. The festivities closed with another grand banquet at the Palacio Nacional, where, in face of four hundred guests, under the canopy of Maximilian's throne and the sceptre and sword of Iturbide in a glass case, sat side by side the representative men of the Sister Republics—Seward and Juárez. So long was the table that, as all could not hear from one end, a second set of speakers were set hard at work at the other, while the band, being unable to tell who was speaking and who was not, "chipped in" from time to time at the most inappropriate moment. It is impossible for us to do justice to the flowers of oratory which alternated with the strains of "Yankee Doodle" and the "Star-spangled Banner." The speech of the evening was, after all, we are told, that of "the homeliest and cleverest orator in Mexico, the Indian scholar, radical republican, brave soldier, and anti-Church statesman, Ignacio M. Altamirano, of Guerrero," the representative of the all but extinct Aztec race. No Mexican banquet being complete without its poem, M. Justo Sierra was the *improvisatore* of the occasion, and we are treated to his poetic burst of spread-eagleism in the original, it being impossible to translate it into English without spoiling it. Altogether it must be allowed that the Republic of Mexico may stand up very creditably by the side of its Northern sister. With all his avowed patriotism, Colonel Evans concedes that the country and climate are finer to live in than his own, the manners and state of culture more refined, the women more beautiful and better dressed, the young people more dutiful and filial. He never saw a badly behaved child in Mexico. "You see no idle, vicious, saucy boys running around on the streets, annoying decent people by their vile language and rude behaviour." Poor as the people are, there is less keeping up of false appearances, less heartburning, less social misery. The ultimate prospects of the country are boundless. We really must find room for one quality of the Mexican corn. So irresistible is it to the pig, that when the skin is wanted, as Mr. Fitch elicited the statement, it is only needful to tie the animal by the tail to a post after four-and-twenty hours fasting, and hold an ear of corn just before his nose, in order to "coax him out of his covering." It argues no slight self-denial on the part of our author that he is indisposed to the annexation of such a country, or its absorption into the States of the Union. How far he echoes here or throughout his narrative the views of his illustrious chief, it is not for us to say. The speeches and addresses with which his pages abound are directed more towards glorifying the past than foreshadowing the future. In his eloquent farewell to the land of "history, romance, flowers, poetry, and song, the land of dark and fearful deeds, violence, wrong, and a terrible past," though the present be mixed and clouded, he looks forward to a bright and glorious future in which the people shall be sovereign, free, and independent. Much idle speculation has, he warns us, been stirred by Mr. Seward's visit. Whatever secret of politics or diplomacy may lurk behind the veil, there is nothing in the present record to bare it to the world. What we do get is a series of very agreeable impressions of a sojourn in Mexico, and our thanks are due to Colonel Evans for so freely and pleasantly imparting his impressions to us.

AMERICAN LITERATURE.

WHEN Mr. Lincoln and his Cabinet determined to put down by force of arms the "evil-disposed persons" in certain of the Southern States who had set the authority of the Federal Government at defiance, ousted its officers, and taken possession of its forts, he found himself, almost at the outset, confronted by a difficulty which had no slight bearing upon the justice and legality of his undertaking. He could not take a single step without a direct violation of the law. In order partly to avert the inconveniences anticipated from the recognition by foreign Powers of the existence of a state of war, partly to conceal from the Northern people, not yet maddened by the excitement of civil war, the fact that they were about to engage in an attempt to do that which both the great political parties had long concurred in pronouncing unconstitutional—namely, the coercion of Sovereign States which, acting as such under the provisions of their several Constitutions, had declared themselves independent of the Union—the President endeavoured to treat the case as one of local disturbance, similar to the well-remembered Whisky Insurrection in Pennsylvania. But he was at once encountered by the retort that he could only interfere in such case at the request of the State Governments, and that without such request he had no right to meddle with matters solely within their jurisdiction; a point which the Constitution made clear enough, and which was illustrated by the conduct of the Federal Government in two or three previous instances, and particularly in that just cited. However, Virginia was invaded in spite of the Constitution; and the defeat of Manassas roused a spirit which made it safe for the Executive to disregard all

constitutional restraints in its dealings with "rebels" in the field. It was more difficult to govern the Southern territory occupied by the Federal armies; and still more difficult to deal with States like Kentucky and Maryland, which, not having seceded, still claimed all the privileges belonging to them under the Constitution, and were disposed to use those privileges for the sake of asserting their own neutrality, if not of opposing the war. Without bringing themselves under any legal liabilities, it was easy for the opponents of the Government in those States to thwart its operations in the most serious manner. Under these circumstances the legal advisers of the President invented a prerogative which had never been conferred by the Constitution, or dreamed of under the rule of the most arbitrary of Mr. Lincoln's predecessors, and which they called the "War Power." The President was Commander-in-Chief of the military forces of the Union; Congress had the power of declaring war and making peace; and in virtue of these two constitutional functions the Republican lawyers claimed for them, together or severally, all the powers which a General in time of war exercises within his lines, and that not only in the occupied Southern States, but within the boundaries of those that remained professedly "loyal." Upon very slender authority derived from constitutional texts, mentioned as slightly as possible, and bolstered up by arguments of greater force derived from writings on international law, from the maxims of military practice, and from the supreme reasoning of necessity, they built up a structure of arbitrary power as complete as ever Russian despot or Roman dictator possessed; a power akin to that enjoyed by the Consul when the Senate had bidden him to take care "ne quid detrimenti respublica capiat." Indeed it was impossible to deny the force of the reasoning that, if the Union was to be maintained by arms, a state of civil war must confer upon its Government powers adequate to the need; and as such powers certainly were not in the written Constitution, they must be extracted from it by inference. The only alternative supposition, that the coercion of a seceding State was not contemplated by the framers of the Constitution, though theoretically true, was indignantly rejected by the enormous majority of Northerners—Democrats as well as Republicans. Thus the War Power was continually magnified with the increasing pressure of necessity, until the theory invested Congress or the President—which of the two was a point to be settled later—with authority to suspend every single security for State rights or individual liberty afforded by the Constitution. We remember well the answer we received from an American of whom we inquired what were the "war powers enjoyed by Mr. Lincoln." "Jes' what he damn pleases." Among the lawyers employed to advise the Government in the exercise and vindication of this extensive authority was Mr. W. Whiting, who published during the war a work upon the subject, carrying out the theory of the War Power more fully, and expounding it more elaborately, than any one else has seen fit to do; and we have now before us a new edition of that work*, to which for the first time has been added, in anticipation of the claims to be preferred by British subjects under the Treaty of Washington, a disquisition on the rights and liabilities of neutrals in time of civil war. It is worth notice that Mr. Whiting very effectually disposes of all the sophistries by which Mr. Seward endeavoured to prevent foreign Governments from recognising a state of war, and upon which he subsequently founded his complaint against us for acknowledging the belligerent rights of the Confederacy. Some of his strongest arguments in defence of Mr. Lincoln's measures are directed to show that there was from the first a state, not merely of insurrection, but of war; that, despite the absurd language of the President's original proclamation, he did in fact treat the entire population of the seceding States, and not only a portion of them, as enemies, and regarded their whole territory as hostile; that they had, in fact, renounced all rights under the Constitution, and were liable after their defeat to be dealt with as a conquered people—forgetting that Congress had repeatedly asserted the contrary, and that its assertions and promises must be considered to have formed the terms (as regards civil rights) upon which the Southern armies surrendered. However that may be, Mr. Whiting practically, if not expressly, bases the present authority of the Federal Government in the South, and the validity of all the Acts of Reconstruction, upon the fact of war and the right of conquest, and thereby admits by inference the duty of foreign Powers to treat North and South exactly alike. As to neutral claims—the only part of the work that is altogether new—his contention virtually amounts to this, that any neutral who took part in the slightest degree against the Union can have no claim for damages; that any neutral who was settled in the South, or who was a partner in a trading firm established there, can claim no redress that might not be claimed by a Confederate citizen; and, finally, that a claim to redress can only be enforced if Congress has assigned funds for the purpose—a doctrine which has been practically employed to defeat many British claims recognised even by American Prize Courts. Happily this last plea will be no longer available under the Treaty of Washington.

* *War Powers under the Constitution of the United States. Military Arrests, Reconstruction, and Military Government. Also, now first published, War Claims of Aliens, with Notes on the Acts of the Executive and Legislative Departments during our Civil War, and a Collection of Cases decided in the National Courts.* By William Whiting. Forty-third Edition. Boston: Lee & Shepard. New York: Lee, Shepard & Dillingham. London: Trübner & Co. 1871.

The "Annual Report of the New York Chamber of Commerce" contains, besides much matter of merely commercial interest, a good deal that has a more general value. An elaborate Report on the value and practicability of a submarine Pacific telegraph is supported incidentally by a statistical table showing, as far as possible, the commercial relations of all civilized nations, the imports and exports to and from every country, and the amount of its trade with every other, and particularly the commerce of European and American nations with the Asiatic Continent. But the subject of most general interest is the Report of the Committee on the Immunity of Private Property from Capture at Sea, and the discussion to which it led. The Report is altogether favourable to the proposed exemption of private property from maritime capture, and states very fully and clearly all that has to be said on that side of the question; and several able speakers seem to have supported the views of the Committee by arguments directed to show, first, that the present practice is a relic of barbarism, and next that America, both as a neutral and as a belligerent, would rather gain than lose by the change. The special value of the Report is the historical sketch which it gives of the laws of maritime war, and particularly of the negotiations of late years upon the right of capture, and upon the provisions of the Treaty of Paris; but it is marked by a tone of hostility towards Great Britain which is matter of regret, and which appears yet more forcibly in the speeches on the opposite side. One or two speakers, indeed, argued against the change on grounds well worth consideration, insisting that private property is not sacred on land, that Sheridan showed no respect for it in the Shenandoah, that Sherman's march was one continual act of pillage and destruction, and that it is absurd to exempt merchandise at sea from the liabilities which attach to it on land; and further arguing that to deprive the belligerent least powerful at sea of the right of revenge is impolitic and impracticable; that England would not fail to requite the invasion and devastation of Canada by the bombardment of New York, and that it would be absurd to bind the New Yorkers not to retaliate by pillaging British commerce on the high seas. The argument was well sustained on both sides, and does credit to the Chamber; the decision—pronouncing the discussion of the proposal inopportune—was less honourable to their judgment and temper, being obviously prompted by a reluctance to forego the chance of avenging in kind upon England the depredations of the *Alabama*.

Dr. McElhinney publishes a thoughtful, learned, and elaborate monograph on the history of what he calls "the doctrine of the Church"—i.e. the views held in different ages and by various authorities respecting her organization, government, discipline, and authority. He divides ecclesiastical history, in connexion with this subject, into four periods, which he calls the Patristic, Papal, Medieval, and Reformed. The first, during which the Church was growing into stability and greatness under the care of those to whose authority the great majority of educated Christians, of whatever creed, allow great weight, and whose expressions in regard to the nature and limits of ecclesiastical jurisdiction and government are carefully collated by the author, extends from St. Clement to Leo the Great; the second, which developed the Papal supremacy into a practical despotism, and which is embraced in a single chapter, comprises the interval between Leo and Gregory VII.; the third is occupied with the demoralization and decline of the Church under the tyranny of Gregory's vicious, grasping, or feeble successors, until the debasement and degradation of Christianity under their auspices drove the Teutonic races into revolt, and produced the Reformation; and the fourth, or Reformed, period, which fills by far the largest space in the volume, extends from Luther to Dr. Pusey, and contains the history of a long succession of conflicting theories and sectarian controversies between Lutheran and Calvinist, Anglican and Puritan, Presbyterian and Independent, Evangelical and Tractarian.

It occurred to an American physician lately to visit Cuba, and thence crossing the Atlantic to make the grand tour of Europe, following the beaten track in which hundreds of his countrymen and ours travel from year to year. Like many of these, he wrote home to the newspapers descriptions and comments at various points in his route; and, these finding editorial favour, he has been rash enough to print a regular narrative of his journey. Published under the title of "Travels of a Doctor of Physic" it suggests to the reader the expectation either of something lively and telling, or of something instructive and professional; certainly not of a mere ordinary diary of a very ordinary traveller in a round familiar to half of those who read it by personal experience, and to the rest by the writings of many earlier and less commonplace travellers. The same objections do not apply to Mr. Bush's

* *Thirteenth Annual Report of the Corporation of the Chamber of Commerce of the State of New York, for the year 1870-71.* In Two Parts. Compiled by George Wilson, Secretary. New York: Press of the Chamber of Commerce. London: Sampson Low, Son, & Marston. 1871.

† *The Doctrine of the Church: an Historical Monograph. With a full Bibliography of the Subject.* By John J. McElhinney, D.D., Milnor Professor of Systematic Divinity in the Theological Seminary of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the Diocese of Ohio. Philadelphia: Claxton, Remsen, & Haffelfinger. London: Sampson Low, Son, & Marston. 1871.

‡ *The Book of Travels of a Doctor of Physic; containing his Observations made in Certain Portions of the Two Continents.* Philadelphia: Lippincott & Co. London: Trübner & Co. 1871.

Siberian Journal.* He had new ground to explore, and was compelled by the nature of his duties and the difficulties encountered in their performance to make a more familiar acquaintance with the country and its inhabitants than travellers in more civilized regions are wont to do. Like a comrade of his whose work we noticed some months since, he was engaged by the American Company, formed in 1864-65 to carry a telegraph across Behring's Straits, and thence by land to St. Petersburg, there to communicate with the European lines. The attempt was founded on a not unnatural scepticism as to the possibility of laying and maintaining a submarine cable across the whole breadth of the Atlantic; and it was abandoned when the success of that enterprise was made manifest. But in the interim Mr. Bush and his companions had visited the Sea of Okhotsk, and in the exploration of the coasts and of the interior had spent some two years, travelling now by boat, now by sledge, now on horseback, and now on snow-shoes; living among the half-savage people of the land, dependent sometimes on their hospitality, and sometimes on their own sportsmanship for provisions; entering their tents and huts, witnessing their labours and their pleasures, their manners and customs, sharing their severe hardships and their simple luxuries; and, in fact, gaining a more intimate knowledge of the country than might have been acquired by a far longer sojourn among a less simple people, and in a climate and society where hardship and necessity did not force them into close communication. There is therefore much that is interesting, and something that is new, in this work; Mr. Bush tells his story with reasonable clearness and vivacity, and illustrates it with sketches that really serve to make the scene or thing described intelligible to the reader; and if the interest of the narrative is never very deep, that is due rather to the inherent dullness of a savage life in a frozen climate than to any defect either of matter or execution for which the author can be held accountable.

Wear and Tear† is the title of a brief and practical essay on the effects of overwork, over-excitement, and ill-derived conditions of life on the constitutions and minds of American men and women. The writer is a medical man, who has become familiar in practice with the evils he describes; with brains worn out on 'Change or at the Bar by labour not merely excessive, but too incessant and too exciting for prolonged endurance; with female frames rendered unfit for all the duties of wives and mothers by a life full of unwholesome habits from the cradle to the grave—neglect in the nursery, overwork and want of exercise at school in the critical period between childhood and maturity, too early entrance on the active and exciting scenes of society, and an after-life rendered languid and unhealthy by the weakness which a youth so spent engenders. He has witnessed the prevalence of diseases that tell the same story—of neuralgia in adults of both sexes; of palsy among children; of dyspepsia in every form; and, above all, of cerebral exhaustion, which, if not relieved in time by total rest, ends shortly and surely in insanity or death. And these experiences he describes for the benefit of those whom they affect, insisting on the necessity of far greater care in regard to the demands made on the brains of children and youths, especially of the weaker sex; of abundant fresh air and ample exercise both for girls and boys; of moderate meals, regular exercise, and timely holidays for men. It is noteworthy that the author's experience would indicate that manufacturers and railway officials are the classes most overtasked in America; merchants and bankers coming next, lawyers suffering less, and medical men least among intellectual labourers—probably because excitement, anxiety, and worry tell more than mere hard work.

The *Medical and Surgical Reports of the Boston City Hospital*‡ constitute a ponderous volume, of which the most important feature is perhaps a careful statistical account of the different classes of operations performed, with the numbers of deaths and recoveries in each class, and the peculiar conditions that affected the result—a compilation which can hardly fail to be useful and suggestive.

Under the title of "American Artist Life"§ we have a large closely-printed octavo volume of biography, recording the lives and labours of all American artists of any note down to the present day, and describing their most popular or most interesting works. We are a little surprised by the length of the list. Practical, and devoted to the worship of the dollar, as she is reputed to be, America can not only afford a market for artistic talent, but can produce and encourage native art of which any of her rivals might be proud. Thus we are told that English artists find nowhere a patronage more liberal than among the self-made men of the manufacturing districts, in the midst

of a society much resembling that of the Northern States; so, too, poetry finds sufficient encouragement in those States to produce in one generation a Bryant, a Willis, a Whittier, a Lowell, and a Longfellow, to say nothing of minor versifiers of no mean ability. A country which can produce so much poetry capable of commanding a foreign circulation, and so much art worth record and preservation as finds mention in the volume before us, is certainly not wholly given over to the worship of the "almighty dollar."

*Wake-Robin** is a pleasant and graceful little book about the haunts and habits of different orders of American birds, in the form of a series of essays interspersed with sketches of American scenery. It is a book which may well be carried in the pocket of any lover of nature intending to ramble among the Adirondacs or in the woods of Vermont, and may afford English naturalists some opportunity for such comparisons as have no savour of odiousness for either side.

Two works on the future life—*West's State of the Dead*†, a sort of controversial exposition of orthodox Protestant doctrine, deformed by bitterness and bad language; and *Stork's Unseen World*‡, a commentary on the "descent into hell" of the Creed—appear to have been called forth by certain recent speculations on an intermediate state which have been rife in America, encouraged no doubt by the spread of so-called Spiritualism. They require no other notice at our hands than a mention of their character and purpose.

Our list concludes with four eminently practical works. *Oral Training*§ is a school-book, intended to be used by a teacher in instructing his junior class in the rudiments of natural science as applied to everyday life—a species of accompaniment or guide to "object lessons," which would be needless to a skilful teacher, and would fail to supply the want of tact and sense in an incompetent one. Downing's *Selected Fruits*|| is a solid volume, containing a detailed description of every favourite species of apple, pear, peach, grape, currant, &c., and the mode of cultivation best adapted to develop the merits and avoid the dangers peculiar to each. *Common Sense in the Household*¶, by Marion Harland, is a practical cookery-book, well spoken of by the ladies to whom we have referred for a judgment on its merits. Finally, Mrs. Mason's "Young Housewife's Counsellor" ** aims at guiding and directing the mistress of a household in all her various duties. It would, as it appears to us, be more likely to mislead a weak and well-meaning woman into Puritanic meddling and vexatious formalism than to give any useful hints to a girl, however inexperienced, who had the wit to profit by the experience of others, and the common-sense to understand or to feel that no experience can entitle another to lay out in this fashion her whole scheme of life and management by rule and measure.

* *Wake-Robin*. By John Burroughs. New York: Hard & Houghton. London: Sampson Low, Son, & Marston. 1871.

† *The State of the Dead*. By the Rev. Anson West. Philadelphia: Lippincott & Co. London: Trübner & Co. 1871.

‡ *The Unseen World in the Light of the Cross*. By T. Stork, D.D. Philadelphia: Lippincott & Co. London: Trübner & Co.

§ *Oral Training Lessons in Natural Science and General Knowledge. Embracing the Subjects of Astronomy, Anatomy, Physiology, Chemistry, Mathematical Geography, Natural Philosophy, the Arts, History, Development of Words, &c.* Intended for Teachers of Public Schools, and also for Private Instruction. By H. Barnard, Principal Lincoln School, Minneapolis. New York and Chicago: Barnes & Co. London: Trübner & Co. 1871.

|| *Selected Fruits: from Downing's Fruit and Fruit-trees of America. With Some New Varieties; including their Culture, Propagation, and Management, in the Garden and Orchard.* By Charles Downing. Illustrated with upwards of Four Hundred Outlines of Apples, Cherries, Grapes, Plums, Pears, &c. New York: Wiley & Son. London: Trübner & Co. 1871.

¶ *Common Sense in the Household: a Manual of Practical Housewifery.* By Marion Harland. New York: Scribner & Co. London: Sampson Low, Son, & Marston. 1871.

** *The Young Housewife's Counsellor and Friend; containing Directions in Every Department of Housekeeping; including the Duties of Wife and Mother.* By Mrs. Mary Mason, Author of "A Wreath from the Woods of Carolina," "Spring-time for Sowing," &c. New York: Published by the Protestant Episcopal Church Book Society. Philadelphia: Lippincott & Co. London: Trübner & Co. 1871.

CAUTION.

Advertisements having appeared offering this Journal and other Newspapers at Half-Price on prepayment, the Public are hereby Cautioned not to enter into any Contract or to send Money for this purpose before making due inquiry as to the respectability of the Advertiser.

NOTICE.

We beg leave to state that we decline to return rejected communications; and to this rule we can make no exception.

The SATURDAY REVIEW is duly registered for transmission abroad.

The publication of the SATURDAY REVIEW takes place on Saturday mornings, in time for the early trains, and copies may be obtained in the Country, through any Newsgent, on the day of publication.

* *Reindeer, Dogs, and Snow-shoes: a Journal of Siberian Travel and Explorations made in the Years 1865, 1866, and 1867.* By Richard J. Bush, late of the Russo-American Telegraph Expedition. With illustrations. New York: Harper & Brothers. London: Sampson Low, Son, & Marston. 1871.

† *Wear and Tear; or, Hints for the Overworked.* By S. Weir Mitchell, M.D., Member of the National Academy of Sciences, &c. Philadelphia: Lippincott & Co. London: Trübner & Co. 1871.

‡ *The Medical and Surgical Reports of the Boston City Hospital.* Edited by J. Nelson Borland, Physician; David W. Cheever, Surgeon. Boston: Little, Brown, & Co. London: Trübner & Co. 1870.

§ *Book of Artists. American Artist Life, comprising: Biographical and Critical Sketches of American Artists; preceded by an Historical Account of the Rise and Progress of Art in America.* By Henry T. Tuckerman. With an Appendix, containing an Account of Notable Pictures and Private Collections. Fifth Impression. New York: Putnam & Son. London: Sampson Low, Son, & Marston. 1870.

Nearly all the back Numbers of the SATURDAY REVIEW may be obtained through any Bookseller, or of the Publisher, at the Office, 38 Southampton Street, Strand, W.C., to whom all Communications relating to Advertisements should likewise be addressed.

Now ready, VOLUME XXXI., bound in cloth, price 16s. Cloth Cases for Binding all the Volumes, price 2s. each. Also, Reading Cases, price 2s. 6d. each. May be had at the Office, or through any Bookseller.

THE SATURDAY REVIEW

POLITICS, LITERATURE, SCIENCE, AND ART.

Price 6d.

CONTENTS OF No. 826, AUGUST 26, 1871:

The Prorogation. The Prospects of the Recess.
Germany and Austria. France. The Admiralty and the Agincourt.
The New York Frauds. Elgin Speeches. The Metropolitan Water Act.
An Object in Life. Knols.
Monumental and Documentary Evidence. The Nine Hours' Movement.
The Royal School and the School of Mines. The Saxons among the Celts. Our Military Position in India.
The Archbishop Land. Cook's Excursionist.
Clark's Riches of Chancer.
Hefele's History of Councils. A Batch of Small School Books.
Ugone. Brewer's Letters and Papers of the Reign of Henry VIII.
Cumberland and Westmoreland M.P.'s. Durnton Abbey.
Mr. Seward in Mexico. American Literature.

CONTENTS OF No. 825, AUGUST 19, 1871:

The Ministry—The Debate on the Royal Warrant—M. Thiers and the Assembly—Coolie Immigration and the Slave Trade—Voting the Supplies—The Versailles Trials—Foreign Decorations—The Phoenix Park Meeting.
The Session—Archæologists at Play—Law and Constitution—The Cholera—The Peak of Derbyshire—The Twelfth and the Grouse—The Prison Ministers' Bill—The Scott Centenary Festival.
Deal on Chinese Buddhism—Eckmann-Charlton on the Outbreak of the French Revolution—Conington and Nettleship's Virgil—Recollections of John Adolphus—Harvesting Corn and Hay in Wet Weather—Landseer's Life of William Berrick—Heath Ghosts—German Literature.

London: Published at 38 SOUTHAMPTON STREET, STRAND, W.C.

ADVERTISEMENTS.

CRYSTAL PALACE.—SPECIAL ATTRACTIONS.—NEXT WEEK.

MONDAY.—BALLAD CONCERT, M. BLONDIN'S PERFORMANCE.
TUESDAY.—OPERA.
WEDNESDAY.—AUTUMN FLOWER SHOW, FOUNTAIN AND GARDEN FÊTE, M. BLONDIN.
THURSDAY.—AUTUMN FLOWER SHOW, OPERA.
SATURDAY.—PROMENADE, MILITARY BAND, &c.
The Fine Arts Courts and Collections, the Technological and Natural History Collections, all the various Illustrations of Art, Science, and Nature, and the Gardens and Park always open. Music and Fountains daily.
Admission: all days 1s., except Saturdays, 2s. 6d. Guinea Season Tickets free.

ALEXANDRA PALACE AND MUSWELL HILL ESTATE TONTINE.

OFFICES: 5 AND 6 GREAT WINCHESTER STREET BUILDINGS, E.C.

ALEXANDRA PALACE.—Notice to the Public. Intending Subscribers can obtain Tickets to View the Palace and Grounds, on application to the Secretary, stating name and address.

ALEXANDRA PALACE.—Arrangements will be made for an early Opening of the Palace and Grounds to the Public, for Completing the Railway into the Palace, as well as other Railway communication.

ALEXANDRA PALACE.—The advantages to Subscribers of One Guinea and upwards are fully detailed in the Prospectus, and Subscribers incur no liability, and must benefit.

ALEXANDRA PALACE.—Art Union.—£500 for a Guinea.

ALEXANDRA PALACE.—The advantages offered to the Public were thus summed up by the "Times" of July 13: "Under the title of 'Alexandra Palace and Muswell Hill Estate Tontine,' certificates representing 550,000 guineas are about to be issued, which will entitle the holders, in proportion as they may possess a single certificate of one guinea or any larger number, to participate in the various objects of the institution, or to take their share of the entire property of the Palace and grounds of 426 acres, should they, fifteen years hence, be among the surviving holders. Under an elaborate but ingenious plan framed for the purpose, each subscriber will have several options as to the mode in which he may obtain a return for his investment, and be virtually guaranteed against loss. The Trustees and Board of Directors consist of experienced persons familiar with the management of London properties and of public establishments, and it may be hoped that the result of their arrangements will be to furnish to the population of the North of the metropolis a place of resort as attractive as that on the other side at Sydenham."

ALEXANDRA PALACE.—The object of the Tontine is to provide for all classes of the inhabitants of the metropolis, and especially of its Northern and Eastern portions and suburbs, and for the many thousands of country excursionists, a grand Institution of healthful recreation and elevating instruction, which will combine the solid advantages of the South Kensington Museum and Schools of Art with the lighter pleasures and pastimes of the Crystal Palace at Sydenham, thus giving effect to the large and enlightened views of the late Prince Consort.

THE BRITISH MUSEUM will be CLOSED on the 1st and RE-OPENED on the 8th of September, 1871. No Visitor can be admitted from the 1st to the 7th of September, inclusive.
British Museum, August 21, 1871. J. WINTER JONES, Principal Librarian.

LONDON INTERNATIONAL EXHIBITION of 1871 will CLOSE on September 30.—Admission DAILY (except Wednesday) from 10 A.M. to 5 P.M., on payment of ONE SHILLING. On Wednesday, Half-a-Crown.

LONDON INTERNATIONAL EXHIBITION of 1872. The General Rules for the Exhibition of Selected Specimens of all varieties of Fine and Decorative Art with Scientific Inventions, and the Manufactures of JEWELLERY, COTTON, MUSICAL INSTRUMENTS, PAPER, and PRINTING, will be Exhibited in 1872, may now be had of the Attendants in the present year's Exhibition, and by letter addressed to the Secretary.—Offices, 3 Royal Albert Hall, Kensington.

JEWELLERY in the INTERNATIONAL EXHIBITION of 1872.—Trades interested in Jewellery and its Machinery.—Selected Specimens of which will be Exhibited in 1872—may obtain the General Rules at the present year's Exhibition, or by written application to the Secretary.—Offices, Royal Albert Hall, Kensington.

COTTON in the INTERNATIONAL EXHIBITION of 1872.—Trades interested in Cotton and its Machinery.—Selected Specimens of which will be Exhibited in 1872—may obtain the General Rules at the present year's Exhibition, or by written application to the Secretary.—Offices, Royal Albert Hall, Kensington.

PRINTING, PAPER and STATIONERY in the INTERNATIONAL EXHIBITION of 1872.—Trades interested in Printing, Paper and Stationery, and their Machinery.—Selected Specimens of which will be Exhibited in 1872—may obtain the General Rules at the present year's Exhibition, or by written application to the Secretary.—Offices, Royal Albert Hall, Kensington.

MUSICAL INSTRUMENTS in the INTERNATIONAL EXHIBITION of 1872.—Trades interested in Musical Instruments.—Selected Specimens of which will be Exhibited in 1872—may obtain the General Rules at the present year's Exhibition, or by written application to the Secretary.—Offices, Royal Albert Hall, Kensington.

DORÉ GALLERY.—GUSTAVE DORÉ, 35 New Bond Street. EXHIBITION OF PICTURES (including "CHRISTIAN MARTYRS," "MONASTERY," "TRIUMPH OF CHRISTIANITY," "FRANCESCA DE RIMINI"). Two to Six.—Admission, 1s.

ST. THOMAS'S HOSPITAL.—The MEDICAL SESSION for 1871 and 1872 will COMMENCE at the NEW HOSPITAL on the Albert Embankment, Westminster Bridge, S.E., on Monday, October 2, 1871, on which occasion an Inaugural Address will be delivered by Mr. LE GROS CLARK, at Two o'clock, after which the DISTRIBUTION OF PRIZES will be made by Sir FRANCIS HUGHES, Treasurer.
Gentlemen entering have the option of paying £40 for the First year, a similar sum for the Second, £30 for the Third, and £10 for each succeeding year; or, by paying £100 at once, of becoming Perpetual Students.

MEDICAL OFFICERS.

Honorary Consulting Physicians.—Dr. Barker and Dr. J. Bland Bennett. Dr. Peacock, Dr. Britton, Dr. Clapton, Dr. Murchison, Dr. Barnes, Mr. Le Gros Clark, Mr. Simon, Mr. Sydney Jones, Mr. Croft, Mr. Liebreich, Dr. Stone, Dr. Ord, Dr. John Harley, Dr. Payne, Dr. Gervis, Mr. MacCormac, Mr. Francis Mason, Mr. Henry Arnott.

Medics.—Dr. Peacock and Dr. Murchison. Surgery.—Mr. Le Gros Clark and Mr. Sydney Jones. General Pathology.—Dr. Britton. Physiology and Practical Physiology.—Dr. Ord and Dr. John Harley. Descriptive Anatomy.—Mr. Francis Mason and Mr. W. W. Westall. Anatomy in the Dissection Room.—Anatomical Lectures, Mr. Rainey and Mr. William Anderson. Chemistry and Practical Chemistry.—Dr. A. J. Beresford. Microscopy.—Dr. Barnes. Practical and Manipulative Surgery.—Mr. Croft and Mr. MacCormac.—Physics and Natural Philosophy.—Dr. Stone. The History of Medicine.—Dr. Clapton. Forensic Medicine and Hygiene.—Dr. Stone and Dr. Gervis. Comparative Anatomy.—Mr. C. Stewart. Ophthalmic Surgery.—Mr. Liebreich. Botany.—Dr. Wale Hiles. Dental Surgery.—Mr. J. W. Elliott. Demonstrations of Morbid Anatomy.—Dr. Payne. Mental Diseases.—Dr. Wm. Ellis Williams. Geographical Distribution of Diseases in England and Wales.—Mr. A. Haviland.

T. B. PEACOCK, M.D., Dean.

R. G. WHITEFIELD, Medical Secretary.

For Entrance or Prospectuses, and for information relating to Prizes and all other matters, apply to Mr. WHITEFIELD, Medical Secretary, The Manor House, St. Thomas's Hospital, Newington, Surrey, S.E.

ST. BARTHOLOMEW'S HOSPITAL and COLLEGE.

The WINTER SESSION will commence on Monday, October 2. Students can reside within the Hospital walls, subject to the College regulations. For all particulars concerning either the Hospital or College, application may be made, personally or by letter, to the Resident Masters of the College, or at the Museum or Library. A Handbook will be forwarded on application.

UNIVERSITY COLLEGE, LONDON.

SESSION 1871-72.

The SESSION of the FACULTY of MEDICINE will commence on Monday, October 2.

INTRODUCTORY LECTURE.—At 3 P.M. The SESSION of the FACULTY of ARTS and LAWS (including the Department of the Fine Arts) will begin on Tuesday, October 3. INTRODUCTORY LECTURE at 4 P.M. by Professor ROBINSON ELLIS, M.A. INAUGURAL LECTURE for the DEPARTMENT of FINE ARTS on Wednesday, October 4, at 3 P.M., by Professor E. J. POTYER, A.R.A.

The SESSION of the FACULTY of SCIENCE (including the Department of the Applied Sciences) will begin on Tuesday, October 3. The EVENING CLASSES for Classics, Modern Languages, Mathematics, the Natural Sciences, Shorthand, &c., will commence on Monday, October 2.

The SCHOOL for BOYS between the ages of Seven and Sixteen will RE-OPEN on Tuesday, September 26. Prospectuses of the various Departments of the College, containing full information respecting Classes, Fees, Days and Hours of Attendance, &c., and Copies of the Regulations relating to the Entrance and other Exhibitions, Scholarships, and Prizes open to Competition by Students of the several Faculties, may be obtained at the Office of the College.

The Examination for the Medical Entrance Exhibitions, and also that for the Anders Entrance Prizes (Faculties of Arts and Laws, and of Science), will be held at the College on the 24th and 25th of September.

The College is close to the Gower Street Station of the Metropolitan Railway, and only a few minutes' walk from the Termini of the North-Western, Midland, and Great Northern Railways.

August, 1871.

JOHN ROBSON, B.A., Secretary to the Council.

OWENS COLLEGE, Manchester.—The NEXT SESSION commences on the 2nd October. Prospectuses, either for the Day or Evening Classes will be forwarded gratis on application.

THE CALENDAR of the COLLEGE, containing full details respecting, and the Courses of Study, Entrance Exhibitions, Scholarships, Examinations for Degrees in the University of London, &c., may be obtained from the Booksellers, and at the College. Price 2s. 6d.; by post, 2s. 9d.

J. G. GREENWOOD, Principal.

J. HOLME NICHOLSON, Registrar.

LONDON UNIVERSITY MATRICULATION.—TWO CAMBRIDGE GRADUATES, a First-Class Man in Classics, M.A., London, and a High Honours Fellow of his College, are forming a CLASS for the "NEXT EXAMINATION, Three Months' Course (two hours three times a week) commencing October 1.—Address, M.A. Cantab, 61 Great Queen Street, Lincoln's Inn Fields.

TRINITY COLLEGE, EASTBOURNE

Master.—Rev. JAMES R. WOOD, M.A.

The NEXT TERM COMMENCES on September 21.

TRINITY COLLEGE, EASTBOURNE

Master.—Rev. JAMES R. WOOD, M.A.

Terms for Boarders.—UPPER SCHOOL, 35 to 36 Guineas (inclusive); JUNIOR SCHOOL, 31 Guineas.

TRINITY COLLEGE, EASTBOURNE

TWO SCHOLARSHIPS, worth £20 a year for Two Years to a Boarder, are offered for Competition in September.—Apply to the Master, Rev. JAMES R. WOOD, M.A., Eastbourne.

INDIAN ENGINEERING COLLEGE, CIVIL SERVICE, and WOOLWICH.

Rev. Dr. HUGHES (Wragg, Joh. Col. Cam.) is now filling up his Vacancies for the Next Term. All the subjects taught by experienced men.—Ealing, W.

INDIAN CIVIL ENGINEERING COLLEGE.—Mr. W. M. LIFTON.

Mr. LIFTON, who takes a limited number of PUPILS, has been very successful at the recent Examination for the above, and at the last Examination for INDIAN TELEGRAPH his Pupils obtained 2nd, 6th, and 17th places.—Address, Sedburgh House, South Hill Park, Hampstead.

INDIAN CIVIL ENGINEERING COLLEGE and WOOLWICH.

Mr. J. ASHTON, M.A. (Fifth Wrangler), prepares CANDIDATES for the above Examinations. At the recent Examination for the I. C. E. College, the successful Candidates in the last Examination for Woolwich the first of the successful Candidates in Mathematics was also a Pupil of Mr. Ashton.—Address, 41 King Henry's Road, South Hampstead.